



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Thursday, 7 August 1969

**FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION**

at 3.10 p.m.

OFFICIAL RECORDS

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 17:	
Development of tourism:	
(a) International Tourist Year	
(b) Implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on International Travel and Tourism	
(c) Review of the programmes and activities of the United Nations system of organizations for the development of tourism ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	231

*President:* Mr. SCHEYVEN (Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 17

**Development of Tourism (E/4615 and Corr.1, E/4627, E/4629, E/4653 and Add.1 to 4, E/4716; E/L.1277, E/L.1278, E/L.1279 and E/L.1280):**

- (a) International Tourist Year
- (b) Implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on International Travel and Tourism
- (c) Review of the programmes and activities of the United Nations system of organizations for the development of tourism (*concluded*)

1. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) said that in view of the interest expressed in the draft resolution submitted by his delegation (E/L.1278) and of the need for a more thorough study of the legal and other implications, he would maintain it for discussion by whatever United Nations organ resumed the debate on item 17, but would not insist on its being put to the vote at the present session of the Council.

2. Mr. ABE (Japan) said that the Council had obviously not completed its discussion of item 17, since very little mention had been made of sub-items (a) and (b). There was no reason, however, why the Council should not discharge its responsibility in connexion with those items, and he believed that the Secretary-General should base the proposed report on a study not merely of the resolution adopted at the Intergovernmental Conference on Tourism held in Sofia in May 1969, but of the whole question of the review of United Nations activities for the development of tourism, of the discussion at the current session of the Council and of any other relevant material. He hoped that the Council would at a future session be able to find an intelligent and constructive solution to the problems confronting it. His delegation was not irrevocably opposed to the creation of a new intergovernmental agency, but for the time being it attached greater importance to operational

activities for the development of tourism than to institutional arrangements. He therefore believed that the Council should not take the imprudent step of referring the item to the General Assembly, and supported the amendments contained in document E/L.1280 to joint draft resolution E/L.1277. His delegation would also continue to give careful consideration to draft resolution E/L.1278.

3. Mr. LÓPEZ HERRARTE (Guatemala) said his delegation believed that draft resolution E/L.1278 was an excellent attempt to ensure an expansion of activities within the United Nations system for the development of tourism. In the view of his Government, such an expansion was desirable. He would therefore vote for that draft if the opportunity arose; failing that, he would support the amendments (E/L.1280) to joint draft resolution E/L.1277.

4. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ LARRETA (Uruguay) said that his Government attached great importance to the development of tourism, since the tourist industry made a major contribution to Uruguay's balance of payments. When the constitution had last been reformed in 1966, a special Ministry of Tourism had been established.

5. His delegation was therefore extremely concerned about the many obstacles to the free development of tourism. A number of highly developed industrialized countries were making it difficult for their citizens to travel abroad by means such as the application of currency restrictions. While the income of countries visited by tourists was being reduced by restrictions on imports, both qualitative and quantitative, the volume of tourism was itself being cut down by the high cost of sea and air transport.

6. Uruguay had supported the main lines of the resolution adopted at the Sofia Conference, and it attached particular importance to the establishment of an intergovernmental body for tourism. The Council had been unable, at its present session, to give the Sofia proposal adequate consideration, but he agreed that it could not transfer its responsibilities in the matter to other United Nations organs. His delegation appreciated draft resolution E/L.1278 submitted by the representative of Mexico, and would support any measures for the early establishment of an intergovernmental organization to deal with tourism and for the formulation of a coherent tourism programme for the United Nations system.

7. Mr. KRISHNAN (India) announced that the sponsors of the amendments contained in document E/L.1280 had decided not to press the amendments to the first pre-ambular paragraph of joint draft resolution E/L.1277. To make it clear precisely what the joint draft resolution

referred to, "agenda item 17 (c)" would be included in the heading, and a reference to the same sub-item would be incorporated in operative paragraph 1. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution had agreed to the insertion in operative paragraph 2 of the words "in the light of the discussions of the subject at the present session of the Council and his 'Review of the Activities and Programmes of the United Nations System of Organizations for the Development of Tourism' (E/4653 and Add.1-4)", with the addition immediately thereafter of the words "including the report of the Intergovernmental Conference on Tourism, held in Sofia, and the text of the resolution adopted by it". The sponsors of the amendments had agreed to the omission of the word "possible" from their amended operative paragraph 2.

8. The sponsors of joint draft resolution E/L.1277 were unable to accept the references to the resumed forty-seventh session of the Council, rather than to the General Assembly, the phrase in operative paragraph 2 beginning "or any other proposals..." (E/L.1280, para. 3), or the amendment to operative paragraph 1 (*ibid.*, para. 4). It had been agreed that the original order of the operative paragraphs would be maintained.

9. Mr. HUDA (Pakistan) said that the item under discussion was concerned with the development of tourism in the interests of the developing countries. It was generally agreed that those countries needed assistance, but it seemed difficult to reach agreement on any action for that purpose. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution therefore felt that the best solution would be to refer the discussion to the General Assembly, since there was no guarantee that any agreement would be reached even at the Council's resumed forty-seventh session, and there was thus a danger that an important debate might be postponed for another year. In addition, since the proposed action was for the benefit of the developing countries, it was felt that more of those countries should be enabled to participate in the debates leading to a decision.

10. Mr. LAURELLI (Argentina) said that his delegation could not accept any draft which would mean that the Council would refer back to the General Assembly obligations which had first been entrusted to it by the Assembly. The essential point of his amendments (E/L.1279), which he had withdrawn in favour of those appearing in document E/L.1280, must be retained. He also wished the reference to the "possible" establishment of an intergovernmental agency to be retained. In his study, the Secretary-General should be requested also to take into account draft resolution E/L.1278, which contained a number of useful points.

11. Mr. HILL (Jamaica) said his delegation's support for the idea of continuing the discussion in the Council rather than in the General Assembly did not mean that it believed the Assembly was not competent to deal with it. Essentially, what his delegation objected to was the way in which the reference of the item to the General Assembly was

timed. According to the report of the Co-ordination Committee on future institutional arrangements for science and technology (E/4739 and Corr.1), precisely such new institutional arrangements as those now being contemplated for tourism were to be considered by the Enlarged Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, and the Co-ordination Committee would consider them only after ascertaining the views of the Governments of Member States and organizations concerned (see draft resolution in document E/4739 and Corr.1, paragraph 6, operative paragraphs 2 and 4). Furthermore, according to paragraph 47 of its report on the second part of its third session (E/4716), the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had recommended that the Council should request ACC to consider what action might best be taken to ensure a full and effective response by the United Nations system to the needs and opportunities in the field of tourism. The adoption of joint draft resolution E/L.1277 would mean by-passing both those stages.

12. He was not clear as to the implications of the phrase "...any other proposals..." in the amended operative paragraph 2 (E/L.1280, para. 3). It might mean that the Secretary-General would have to hold additional consultations with the specialized agencies; if that were the case, time should be allowed for him to obtain and digest their views and those of Governments, and consequently the Council might not find it desirable to resume discussion of the item before its forty-ninth session.

13. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) said his delegation strongly supported joint draft resolution E/L.1277 with the amendments announced by the representative of India. In its view, the General Assembly was fully competent to discuss the matter. The resumed forty-seventh session of the Council would be very short, and its agenda was already overburdened. The General Assembly was a more representative body and could give more attention to a complex subject which had political overtones.

14. His delegation was strongly in favour of transforming IUOTO, 80 per cent of whose membership already consisted of governmental bodies, into an intergovernmental organization with universal membership, within the United Nations system. Excellent reasons for such a change were adduced in the note submitted by the Secretary-General of IUOTO (E/4653/Add.4), including the difficulties created for members by the organization's legal status, which prevented it from co-operating adequately with United Nations bodies (para. 11).

15. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) hoped that the Council's report would say that item 17 (a) and (b) would be discussed at a future session of the Council. He was willing to accept a reference in the new operative paragraph 2 of joint draft resolution E/L.1277 to the report of the Sofia Conference and the resolution adopted by it, but suggested that the words "as well as the report" should be used instead of "including the report". Reference of the item to the Council's resumed forty-seventh session did not mean that it would not go to the General Assembly. He did

not share the Jamaican representative's fear that the inclusion of the phrase "any other proposals designed to provide more effective machinery for the development of tourism" would require the Secretary-General to obtain information from the United Nations system of organizations, since such information had already been supplied in the Secretary-General's report (E/4653 and Add.1 to 4).

16. Mr. LÓPEZ HERRARTE (Guatemala) asked the sponsors of the joint draft resolution whether they would be prepared to accept the inclusion of the phrase "the Secretary-General should also take account of the Mexican proposals" in the new operative paragraph 2.

17. Mr. KRISHNAN (India) said that the sponsors would be willing to replace the words "or any other proposals designed to provide more effective machinery" in the new operative paragraph 2 by the words "and on any other effective measures". It seemed unnecessary to mention specific proposals, such as those contained in draft resolution E/L.1278, in view of the phrase, already to be found in the new paragraph 2, "in the light of the discussions of the subject at the present session of the Council".

18. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) was prepared to accept the words "and on any other effective measures", provided that the words "such as those contained in the draft resolution submitted by Mexico (E/L.1278)" were added.

19. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the Indian representative's views. If a reference to the Mexican proposals was made, other proposals might also have to be included.

20. Mr. KRISHNAN (India) regretted that he was unable to accept the proposal by the United States representative to add the words "such as those contained in the draft resolution submitted by Mexico (E/L.1278)", for the inference would be that the Council had considered the Mexican proposals and was asking the Secretary-General to take them into account. The phrase "in the light of the discussions of the subject at the present session of the Council" in the new operative paragraph 2 implicitly included draft resolution E/L.1278. He would be prepared to accept the insertion of the words "and the proposals" between the word "subject" and the word "at" at the beginning of the new operative paragraph 2.

*The meeting was suspended at 5.5 p.m. and resumed at 5.45 p.m.*

21. Mr. KRISHNAN (India) said that as a result of consultations held during the recess, agreement had been reached on the following wording for the two operative paragraphs. In operative paragraph 1, the words "General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session" would be replaced by the words "resumed forty-seventh session of the Council with a request to submit its conclusions to the twenty-

fourth session of the General Assembly". In operative paragraph 2, the words "through the resumed forty-seventh session of the Council" would be inserted before the words "and submit".

22. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to operative paragraph 1, said that the text read out by the Indian representative was slightly different from that to which his delegation had agreed in the informal consultations. That was no doubt due to a misunderstanding and he suggested a brief suspension of the meeting in order to clarify the matter.

23. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation could support the text proposed by the Indian representative.

*The meeting was suspended at 5.50 p.m. and resumed at 6.15 p.m.*

24. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was prepared to accept the compromise formula proposed. In its view, however, the interests of the developing countries would be better served if an intergovernmental tourism organization were established as soon as possible.

25. The PRESIDENT invited delegations to vote on joint draft resolution E/L.1277, as amended.

*The joint draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

26. Mr. LAURELLI (Argentina) said his delegation had abstained from voting because it believed that to postpone positive action on the matter until the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly would be prejudicial to the studies requested. Furthermore, his delegation considered that there would not be sufficient time between the resumed forty-seventh session of the Council and the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly to provide countries with an opportunity to comment on and take decisions regarding the measures adopted at the resumed session.

27. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) associated his delegation with the remarks made by the Argentine representative, and said that his delegation regarded the word "measures" in operative paragraph 2 of the resolution as including all possible alternative machinery.

28. Mr. KRISHNAN (India), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of joint draft resolution E/L.1277, expressed appreciation for the constructive and co-operative spirit shown by all delegations in the informal consultations. He regretted, however, that the Council had been unable to adopt the resolution unanimously.

29. Mrs. GUTMAN de CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) requested that the Council's report should contain a reference to draft

resolution E/L.1278 submitted by her delegation and that the text of that resolution should be included in the recommendations of the resumed forty-seventh session.

30. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed his delegation's gratitude to the sponsors of the joint draft resolution for the flexibility they had shown, which had made it possible to reach almost unanimous agreement. His delegation had accepted the compromise text in order to have time in which to seek a constructive solution, and it would present practical proposals to the Council at its resumed forty-seventh session with a view to making it possible for the Council to refer the matter to the General Assembly. He stressed the importance of the Council's adhering to the spirit of the Sofia Conference.

31. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that his delegation had been encouraged by the spirit of mutual understanding which had characterized the Council's discussions and led to the adoption of a resolution which no delegation had opposed. He realized that there were still difficulties on questions of substance. His delegation did not agree with the formula supported by the USSR representative but believed that the spirit shown during the debate indicated that it would be possible to reach agreement at the resumed forty-seventh session. Positive action could then be taken on the matter at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.