AGENDA ITEM 10
Problems of the human environment (E/4667, E/4710; E/L.1275/Rev.1) (resumed from the 1630th meeting and concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the revised draft resolution on problems of the human environment (E/L.1275/Rev.1). He pointed out that the text included, following the preamble, a draft resolution for submission to the General Assembly.

2. Mr. VIAUD (France) proposed the addition of the following words at the end of paragraph 13 of the draft resolution: “in particular by preparing a selective agenda, by simplifying the organizational structure and by limiting documentation to a reasonable volume”.

3. Mr. CAPPELEN (Norway) was surprised at the French representative’s concern that certain elements in the preamble of the draft resolution were not reflected in the operative part; he saw no reason why there should be complete correspondence between the two parts of the draft resolution.

4. Mr. McDONALD (United States of America) supported the revised draft resolution. He was in full agreement with the idea of reducing costs and limiting documentation, but did not think it necessary to amend the text.

5. Mr. KRYLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had proposed (1629th meeting) an amendment to operative paragraph 11 and requested a separate vote on that paragraph.

6. Mr. VIAUD (France) maintained his amendment to operative paragraph 13. If the draft resolution was adopted, the preambular paragraphs would not appear in the text submitted to the General Assembly and the considerations regarding costs and documentation would therefore not be brought to its notice. He asked the Secretariat whether the revised draft resolution would alter the financial implications of the proposed conference.

7. Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) replied that the initial financial estimates for the conference would need to be revised, particularly since documentation and printing accounted for a considerable proportion of the expenditure. He wished to pay a tribute to the valuable assistance of UNESCO in the preparation of the Secretary-General’s report on the problems of the human environment (E/4667).

8. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) requested separate votes on operative paragraphs 6 and 7.

9. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the USSR proposal to delete the words “Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies and IAEA” in operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution E/L.1275/Rev.1.

   The USSR amendment was rejected by 14 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.

10. Mr. KRYLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 11.

   The paragraph was adopted by 21 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

11. The PRESIDENT put operative paragraph 6 to the vote.

   The paragraph was adopted by 18 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

12. The PRESIDENT put operative paragraph 7 to the vote.

   The paragraph was adopted by 19 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

13. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the French amendment to operative paragraph 13.

   The amendment was rejected by 14 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions.

President: Mr. SCHHEYVEN (Belgium).
14. Mr. LÓPEZ HERRARTE (Guatemala), explaining his vote, said that he had voted in favour of the French amendment because he felt that the General Assembly should be made aware of the Council's views on costs and documentation.

15. Mr. QUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that he had abstained in the vote because he felt that the substance of the French amendment was covered in operative paragraph 3.

16. The PRESIDENT put draft resolution E/L.1275/Rev.1 to the vote as a whole.

The draft resolution was adopted by 23 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

17. Mr. KRYLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his delegation's vote, said that the resolution adopted was contrary to the important principle of universality. The conference referred to could not exclude certain countries from any decisions which might be reached. The absence of such countries would reduce the effectiveness of the conference.

18. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) regretted that he had been unable to vote for the resolution, despite his full agreement with the convening of the conference, because of his delegation's views on universality.

19. Mr. GUELEV (Bulgaria) explained that he had not voted in favour of the resolution because it was important for all countries to be invited to the conference.

20. Mr. JERBI (Libya) said that he had voted for the resolution as a whole but had abstained from voting on operative paragraphs 6, 7 and 11 because they had political connotations.

21. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslovla) said that he had voted in favour of the USSR amendment because he considered the principle of universality extremely important.

22. Mr. HEYMAN (Observer for Sweden), speaking under rule 75 of the rules of procedure, expressed his Government's pleasure at the Council's decision to recommend to the General Assembly that the conference on the human environment should be held in Sweden in June 1972.

(c) Review of the programmes and activities of the United Nations system of organizations for the development of tourism

23. Mr. KRISHNAN (India) introducing draft resolution E/L.1277 on the development of tourism, recalled that an Intergovernmental Conference on Tourism had been held in Sofia in May 1969 to work out effective institutional arrangements for the development of tourism. The Conference had adopted a resolution, reproduced in its report (E/4653/Add.1), containing guidelines for the creation of an intergovernmental tourism organization. The significance of tourism for the economic development of developing countries was widely recognized, and it was on that basis that the various United Nations bodies concerned had for the past few years been searching for effective ways to promote it.

24. In operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution E/L.1277, the sponsors proposed that consideration of the item should be referred to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session. He recalled that, at the 1603rd meeting, it had been agreed that there should first be a general debate on item 17, on tourism, in plenary meeting and that the matter should then be referred to the Co-ordination Committee for more detailed examination. Various delegations had held informal consultations at the current session with a view to determining the best way in which the Council could act on the decision taken at the Sofia Conference. The results of those consultations were not yet entirely satisfactory. It had been hoped to start the debate on the item early in the session so as to ensure a wide exchange of views, but the discussion had been postponed. Given the differences of opinion of the subject, the sponsors considered that it would be very difficult to have a useful exchange of views in the little time remaining before the end of the session. They therefore thought that it would be wiser not to attempt to reach a decision at the present and to refer the matter to the General Assembly. In that way, there would be sufficient time for delegations to hold consultations and to discuss the question in the various competent bodies of individual Governments.

25. The sponsors believed that the report requested in operative paragraph 2 would help the General Assembly to understand all aspects of the problem and to decide how the resolution of the Sofia Conference could be implemented by the United Nations. In conclusion, he stressed that the draft resolution was of a procedural nature.

26. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) said that his delegation, which had played an active part in the Sofia Conference, considered it desirable to hold a debate on tourism at the current session of the Council. Tourism was clearly becoming more and more important and had political and other implications. He read out the text of a draft resolution which his delegation intended to submit formally to the Council.  

---

1 Subsequently issued as document E/L.1278.
27. The developing countries expected the United Nations to help them in their economic development activities; they also expected to obtain assistance from appropriate international bodies in developing tourism. His delegation felt that its draft resolution would make it possible to use an existing body which had already proved its usefulness and of which most of the countries represented on the Council were members. If the solution recommended in the draft resolution was not acceptable, that would not prevent his or any other delegation from stressing, in the General Assembly, that there was need for a body within the United Nations system to deal with tourism.

28. Mr. GAMACCHIO (International Civil Aviation Organization) said that his comments on draft resolution E/L.1277 might also be applied to the Mexican draft resolution. In presenting the report of ICAO (E/4656 and Add.1) to the Council at its current session (1606th meeting), the President of the ICAO Council had indicated that he was unable to comment on the resolution of the Intergovernmental Conference on Tourism since its terms were rather general and it was not clear how such a new body would fit into the existing pattern of co-ordinated activities under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council. It was essential to avoid duplication of work done by existing agencies. He had pointed out that the present definition of the term "tourist" covered persons travelling not only for recreation but also for business purposes. Therefore surveys and studies relating to tourists might well duplicate the activities of other bodies.

29. He therefore suggested that draft resolution E/L.1277 should include a provision to the effect that, in preparing the report to be submitted to the General Assembly, the Secretary-General should also take into consideration the problems of co-ordination, in consultation with ACC.

30. Mr. LAURELLI (Argentina) said that considerable differences of views had emerged at the Intergovernmental Conference on Tourism between countries that received tourists and those from which they came. His delegation did not agree that a new body should be established, since the existing organization was already rendering satisfactory service. Nor did it believe that the matter should be referred to the General Assembly. The Council should proceed with caution in dealing with the matter.

31. He therefore proposed the replacement, in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/L.1277, of the words "to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session" by the words "to the Economic and Social Council at its forty-ninth session".

32. In conclusion, he said that his delegation could not accept a draft resolution that did not include the "Vienna formula", which had been applied in other organizations and had served well.

33. Mr. ABE (Japan) thanked IUOTO for its informative report on International Tourist Year (E/4627) and for the initiative it had taken to promote tourism.

34. Intensive mobilization of public interest in tourism had been one of the most important achievements of International Tourist Year, in which Japan had played a very active part. It hoped that the year would open up a new phase of further development and intensification of tourist activities at the national and at the international level.

35. With regard to the implementation of United Nations recommendations on international travel and tourism, Council resolution 1109 (XL) invited United Nations bodies and specialized agencies to give favourable consideration to requests for providing increased technical and financial assistance to the developing countries in order to speed the development of their tourist resources. His delegation was glad to note the progress made in that respect and hoped that further efforts would be made along those lines by the organizations concerned.

36. Another example of international co-operation had been the Interregional Seminar on Tourism Development, held in Berne in October and November 1968. As could be seen from the Secretary-General's report (E/4615 and Corr.1), the seminar had succeeded in increasing awareness of the importance of tourism, particularly for the economic development of developing countries.

37. For the past several years, Japan had annually received some thirty trainees, mainly from Asia, under the Colombo Plan, United Nations technical assistance programmes and other bilateral arrangements. The programmes ranged from vocational training and the organization of tourist agencies to the administration of the tourist industry. Japan also sent experts on tourism to the developing countries in Asia to provide advice on tourist development programmes.

38. As to the review of the programmes and activities of the United Nations system of organizations for the development of tourism, it was essential to strengthen the programmes and activities relating to tourism both inside and outside the United Nations system. There were two aspects: the operational and the institutional. With regard to the operational aspect, there was room for strengthening the programmes and activities of IUOTO, and his delegation would support any practical steps aimed at assigning that organization more operational functions and activities. Among the various operational areas in which IUOTO would be able to contribute to the development of tourism was the development of natural resources for tourism and co-ordination of activities at the international level. The first—development of natural resources—was a prerequisite for promoting the tourist industry. Adequate facilities would also be necessary to attract tourists. To strengthen IUOTO by enabling it to join in the activities of the UNDP would undoubtedly greatly promote the development of natural resources for the tourist industry. He wondered to what extent IUOTO could participate under its existing status in UNDP activities.
39. As to the other area—co-ordination of the activities of the United Nations and other organizations relating to tourism—it would be most useful to strengthen IUOTO's role and functions in assisting the Council in such co-ordination in view of IUOTO's competence.

40. He wondered whether it would not be possible to strengthen the operational activities of IUOTO without changing its institutional status. The Council should weigh carefully any proposal to establish a new intergovernmental body: efforts should rather be made to strengthen existing machinery, particularly at a time when the question of the proliferation of new intergovernmental bodies within the United Nations family was under serious study. Furthermore, the proposed change in the nature of IUOTO might destroy one of the bases on which it operated, namely, the active participation of the private sector. Such a change would also reduce the autonomy and flexibility which it had enjoyed so far and which had been one of the reasons for its remarkable achievements.

41. His Government was strongly opposed to the establishment of a new intergovernmental body.

42. He supported the Argentine proposal that the Council should defer the matter to a later session, preferably the next summer session.

43. With regard to the Mexican draft resolution, he agreed that the Council should continue to deal with the matter and not refer it to the General Assembly for consideration.

44. Mr. BENLER (Turkey) believed that the Council should study the question in greater detail than hitherto, since his Government attached great importance to the development of tourism, especially in the developing countries. Paragraph 6 of the Secretary-General's report on the activities of the United Nations system of organizations for the development of tourism (E/4653) contained a number of relevant comments in that respect. His delegation had been very active in the discussions at the Sofia Conference and also in the informal discussions held during the current session of the Council. Among other things, it had proposed Istanbul as the seat of the proposed new intergovernmental agency.

45. He agreed with the representatives of Mexico and Argentina that the Council should attempt to discharge its functions in connexion with tourism, rather than simply transfer the matter to the General Assembly, but would prefer the discussion to be resumed at the current session rather than at a future session of the Council.

46. Mr. NESTERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation fully understood and shared the developing countries' concern to develop tourism. When in 1967 the idea of converting IUOTO into an intergovernmental organization had first been raised, the Soviet Union had supported it; then, at the Sofia Conference, his delegation had been requested to support the proposal for the establishment of a new intergovernmental agency and, because of its sympathy for the developing countries' views, it had agreed to do so. His delegation had therefore come to the Council with instructions from its Government relating to the establishment of an intergovernmental tourism organization, as proposed in the resolution adopted at Sofia. It now found itself confronted, in the Mexican proposal, with what was in effect a return to the former approach. He would therefore need time to consult his Government, which in turn would need to consult Soviet tourist organizations.

47. His delegation was accordingly not in a position to support the Mexican draft resolution. In any case, the legal aspects were not clear; he would welcome information from the Secretariat as to whether the Council was in fact entitled to recommend changes in the structure of an independent organization.

48. The best way out of the Council's dilemma would be to adopt draft resolution E/L.1277. He could, if necessary, make an extensive statement on tourism, touching on such aspects as the need for universality of representation in any organization which was to be set up, but for purely practical reasons he preferred to support that draft resolution. The procedure he suggested would allow time for delegations to consult their Governments and for detailed discussion by the General Assembly leading to a realistic solution, beneficial to tourism, reached on a basis of agreement.

49. Mr. WILLIAMS (International Monetary Fund) had comments to make in connexion with the list of international agencies concerned with tourism (E/4653/Add.2). IMF was concerned with tourism in so far as it affected the balance of payments of member Governments, which necessitated keeping statistical data on tourism constantly under review. In addition, restrictions on tourism arising from travel allowances and exchange controls were discussed annually and, in the case of countries with a convertible currency, any such proposed allowances and controls must be approved by IMF. Proposed changes in rates of exchange were also brought to IMF's notice and sometimes required its approval.

50. Mr. KOTSCHNIG (United States of America) said that everything possible should be done to promote the development of tourism, especially for the benefit of the developing countries. The United States was deeply interested in tourism and its potential contribution was very substantial. In 1966, almost 3 million United States tourists had gone abroad and the figure had subsequently risen to almost 4 million, not including those visiting Canada and Mexico, who amounted to between 14 million and 15 million each year. In monetary terms, expenditures of United States travellers, excluding payments to United States carriers, had totalled to almost $4,000 million in 1968. Tourism was therefore big business and the United States wished that business to operate to the greater benefit of the developing countries.
His delegation had hoped that agreement would be reached during the current session which would ensure that everything possible was done to develop activities relating to tourism within the United Nations system, and to strengthen IUOTO. Informal discussions had eliminated many points of conflict, but, if the procedure laid down in draft resolution E/L.1277 was followed, all the effort which had gone into those discussions would be wasted. The General Assembly would be required to start again from the beginning and would stand little chance of reaching satisfactory agreement.

While he agreed with the remarks of the representatives of Argentina and Japan, he felt it had not yet been stated with sufficient clarity that to refer consideration of the item to the General Assembly would mean that no guidance would be given to IUOTO, at its forthcoming session in October 1969, on means of achieving the more direct and productive relationship to the United Nations system which was generally felt desirable.

The Mexican draft resolution, on the other hand, offered some prospect of providing such guidance; it contained a number of constructive ideas derived from the informal discussions which had taken place. His delegation would therefore welcome the opportunity to discuss it, although it did not agree with every aspect of the text. He did not agree, as the representative of the Soviet Union appeared to believe, that discussion should centre upon the resolution adopted at the Sofia Conference and his view was supported by the title of agenda item 17(c). It was clear that the concept of universality of membership, which the United States opposed, had introduced a political issue into the discussion on tourism which was making a satisfactory solution of the problem more difficult and thus obstructing efforts to promote tourism to the developing countries to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) described as somewhat incongruous a situation in which, even before the debate on the item began, several members submitted a draft resolution requesting referral of the item to the General Assembly and gained the support of the delegation of one of the major Powers on the grounds that the instructions it had received from its Government were not sufficiently broad. Nevertheless, constructive contributions to the debate had been made by a number of representatives.

He agreed with the representatives of Argentina and the United States that the Council should try to reach some decision on the item. The Mexican draft resolution appeared constructive and he looked forward to the opportunity to study it, but until then he would support the Argentine amendment to draft resolution E/L.1277. As far as the "Vienna formula" was concerned, he agreed with the representative of Argentina.

His delegation could not accept the argument that draft resolution E/L.1277 was merely procedural. Even a decision to refer the item to the General Assembly went beyond procedure, while the request to the Secretary-General, in operative paragraph 2, to submit a report to the General Assembly was clearly substantive. In any case, his delegation did not believe that the report should be confined to the various implications of establishing an intergovernmental tourism organization, since that would be prejudging the General Assembly's discussions on the subject. Furthermore, it had been suggested that only sub-items 17(c) should be referred to the General Assembly, but the text of the resolution referred to the whole item; his delegation believed that sub-items 17(a) and (b) could be dealt with adequately by the Council at its current session.

Spain had celebrated International Tourism Year through its information media, by introducing special school and university courses and by publishing literature aimed at encouraging friendship and understanding among peoples. Tourism had been encouraged by keeping prices low, by simplifying formalities, by increasing hotel capacity and by considerable investment in infrastructure and superstructure.

The Secretary-General's reports on the implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on International Travel and Tourism and the United Nations Interregional Seminar on Tourism Development (E/4629 and E/4615 and Corr.1) made it clear that tourism was an industry in which great care should be exercised. The introduction of a tourist industry during the first stage of a country's economic development might result in a loss of resources and currency, with corresponding adverse effects on economic development. But that did not mean that international tourism could not contribute to national income; it generated employment and might stimulate economic growth in areas where available resources did not allow any other type of activity.

The United Nations clearly understood the importance of tourism was shown by its technical and financial assistance to the developing countries. The Secretary-General's report on the activities of the United Nations system of organizations for the development of tourism (E/4653) set forth the conditions in which a tourist industry could be established. For such aid to be effective, sound co-ordination and co-operation in a dynamic and integrated programme were essential.

At the twentieth session of its General Assembly, IUOTO had approved in principle its conversion into an intergovernmental organization on the grounds that, as constituted, it was not equal to the demands made on it,
and the recent Sofia Conference had adopted a resolution inviting the Economic and Social Council to approve guidelines for the creation of an intergovernmental tourism organization and to recommend its creation to the General Assembly.

62. Few countries had succeeded as well as Spain in developing a satisfactory tourist industry within a short space of time, and his delegation therefore felt that it was in an especially favourable position to assess the timeliness of such a proposal. It therefore reiterated the position it had taken in Sofia and stressed its conviction that such an agency could play a major role in the promotion of economic development and mutual understanding and in the establishment of lasting peace. Co-ordination and co-operation among the many organs and agencies within the United Nations system more or less directly concerned with tourism would be greatly increased and inefficiency and duplication avoided.

63. Mr. DUMONTET (United Nations Development Programme), replying to the Japanese representative's question, said that, under General Assembly resolution 1240 (XIII) part B, paragraph 39, UNDP projects should be executed whenever possible by the United Nations, by the specialized agencies concerned, or by IAEA, but the resolution also provided that the services of other agencies, private firms or individual experts could be called upon. The Administrator was at liberty to recommend to the Governing Council of UNDP that the services of an organization outside the United Nations system should be contracted for, if he felt that cases such as those mentioned in paragraph 34 of resolution 1240 (XIII) had arisen and that it was therefore necessary to call on such an organization to implement a particular project. For example, the services of IDB had co-operated with ITU in the UNDP-assisted project entitled "Pre-investment Study for the Inter-American Telecommunication Network" in South America.

64. Mr. HILL (Jamaica) thought that the preamble to draft resolution E/L.1277 should include some reference to the views of the delegations attending the Sofia Conference which had not supported the resolution adopted. In addition, the request in operative paragraph 2 that the Secretary-General should study the guidelines set out in the resolution of the Sofia Conference and submit a report was clearly not procedural. The point made by the United States representative that some guidance should be given to IUOTO at the forthcoming General Assembly was extremely relevant, and his delegation also agreed with the view of the representative of Japan that what was really needed was some link between IUOTO and the United Nations system so that the former could benefit from the funds available to UNDP. If the Secretary-General was to be requested to report on the implications of establishing an intergovernmental tourism organization, he should also be requested to bear IUOTO in mind in that connexion.

65. The primary need of the developing countries, so far as tourism was concerned, was for financial aid to enable them to develop their natural resources. The essential point was that that need should be met and not what type of organization—whether a new agency or a remodelled expansion of IUOTO—should be responsible. He agreed with the representative of Japan that the establishment of a new agency would give rise to dangers of proliferation and excessive bureaucracy and hoped that the discussion of the item as a whole could be deferred to a later session of the Council, in order to allow time for consultation between delegations and their Governments, and among Governments themselves.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.