



UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL
E/CN.12/A.C.23/SR.2
16 April 1953
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA
Fifth Session
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

COMMITTEE VI (COORDINATION)

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Held at Rio de Janeiro on Thursday, 16 April 1953
at 5.45 p.m.

CONTENTS: 1) Statement by the representative of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council
2) Draft resolution submitted by the Delegations of Argentina, Brazil and Chile (Conference Room Paper № 1, Documents: E/CN.12/311
E/CN.12/320

PRESENT :

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. NORIEGA MORELES	Guatemala
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. DE TINGUY DU POUET	France
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. PORTELA	Argentina
	Mr. MIGUEL DE ALBÉIDA	Brasil
	Mr. MEJIA PALACIO	Colombia
	Mr. DOBLES	Costa Rica
	Mr. SILVAN RIO	Cuba
	Mr. SEPÚLVEDA	Chile
	Mr. CRESPO ORDOÑEZ	Ecuador
	Mr. MARTÍNEZ	El Salvador
	Mr. BOHAN	United States of America
	Mr. HUDICOURT	Haiti
	Mr. ANDOR	Mexico
	Mr. BARRETO	Peru
	Mr. GODFREY	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. JACKSON	
	Mr. GARIBOLDI	Dominican Republic
	Mr. ITURBIDE	Uruguay
	Mr. CASAS BRICEÑO	Venezuela

Also Present

Also present

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. FORCART

United Nations
Educational
Scientific and
Cultural
Organization
(UNESCO)

Representative of an inter-governmental organization:

Mr. HUERTEMATTE

Inter-American
Economic and
Social Council
(IA-ECOSOC)

Secretariat:

Mr. PREBISCH

Executive Secretary

Mr. SANTA CRUZ

Secretary of the
Committee

/STATEMENT BY

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTER-AMERICAN
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Mr. HEURTEMATTE (Inter-American Economic and Social Council) requested that the following statement be inserted verbatim in the record.

"Mr. Chairman, Delegates,

During this Committee's last meeting I placed before its members the instructions imparted by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council to its representatives at this fifth session of ECLA. These instructions define the present position of that body concerning co-ordination of its work with that of this Commission.

I do not think it necessary to repeat them here, as they are clear, precise and I am sure that all those present are fully aware of them. These instructions reflect the unanimous consensus of the present opinion of the governments concerning the subject under discussion, expressed through their representatives on IA-ECOSOC.

I declared and maintained, at the same meeting, that it would be neither desirable nor proper for the fifth session of ECLA to indicate rules to Professor Prebisch, which might restrict his freedom of action for considering and recommending together with Dr. Lleras Camargo, any of the procedures which in his opinion might be conducive towards achieving effective

/co-ordination at

co-ordination at the government level.

Professor Prebisch agreed with this view, but stated that perhaps his task would be made easier if some of the Representatives made statements on co-ordination so as to prevent his reaching any agreement with Dr. Lleras Camargo which might later not be accepted by ECLA.

I am glad to admit that I understand and share Professor Prebisch's concern. His desire to explore the situation is logical and practical. I may say that Dr. Lleras Camargo proceeded in exactly the same way at the Inter-American Economic and Social Council. It was precisely those statements and observations on co-ordination, made by the representatives of Governments at Dr. Lleras Camargo's request, which formed the basis of the instructions on this point which the Council gave to those having the honour to represent it at this ECLA meeting.

The debate which this subject aroused in IA-ECOSOC was intense and exhaustive. All its aspects were analysed and discussed, and the conclusion was reached that it was neither opportune, nor practical, nor wise to approve new resolutions or to make statements on co-ordination at the government level until such time as Professor Prebisch and Doctor Lleras Camargo had rendered a joint report, as was agreed by ECLA and by IA-ECOSOC in the resolutions of 15 June and 30 August 1951, approved respectively by the two organizations /in Mexico

in Mexico and Panama".

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE DELEGATIONS OF ARGENTINA, BRAZIL AND CHILE (CONFERENCE ROOM PAPER N^o 1; DOCUMENTS E/CN.12/311 and E/CN.12/320)

Mr. PORTELA (Argentina) said that the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil and Chile was put forward partly as a response to the Executive Secretary's statement at the previous meeting, that the opinions of delegations would be of value to him in putting forward recommendations on co-ordination. One of the most important problems involved was that of the timing of international conferences and the avoidance of duplication of effort. His Delegation had therefore associated itself with the Brazilian and Chilean delegations in trying to devise a solution by which organizations serving the common cause of Latin-American countries might do so effectively. As co-sponsor of the draft, the Argentine delegation had no objection to any amendments which might be proposed, provided that the substance was not changed.

Mr. ALMEIDA (Brazil) said that he felt compelled to comment on the initial statement by the representative of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council so as to clarify a few points.

He could not agree with Mr. Heurtematte that the instructions given him by the IA-ECOSOC precluded in any way the discussion of the problem of "co-ordination" at

/the current

the current session of ECLA. The same governments which composed the Inter-American Organization were represented at ECLA and, as sovereign and responsible governments they could and should have the liberty to reverse any previous decisions whenever different circumstances made that attitude advisable or necessary. And that was exactly what had happened.

Everybody knew that once set up, international organizations tended to develop a personality of their own within their different frameworks, in such a way that the representatives of the same Governments in different bodies might not be in the best position to judge clearly the needs of other organizations. Thus, it should be no motive for surprise if the IA-ECOSOC in reaching its decisions had overlooked the special circumstances under which ECLA was meeting, i.e., for the first time as a permanent body of the United Nations.

As the result of decisions by the UN-ECOSOC and the Seventh Session of the General Assembly it had exchanged its provisional status for that of a permanent organ of the United Nations. That fact was sufficient in itself to justify the need to reaffirm now not only the previous decisions of the Commission on the problem of co-ordination with other regional bodies, but also the need to integrate ECLA once and for all in the structure of international organizations.

Concerned with Latin American Affairs

1970-1971

concerned with Latin American economic problems.

It should be noted also that on the basis of the reports submitted to the Commission it became obvious that the recommendations made at the Fourth ECLA Session - in Mexico - for co-ordination at governmental level had not been implemented as speedily as was desirable. As a result of those delays, which were perhaps unavoidable, conferences continued to be held at short intervals and many governments were beginning to concern themselves with the administrative difficulties inherent in the process of attending so many meetings held with such short intervals between them.

A calendar for economic conferences in the region would certainly obviate that inconvenience and there were really no valid reasons for not taking the necessary steps in that direction at the current session of the Commission. That was really the substance of the joint proposal by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil and Chile and any decisions taken on the subject would automatically override any taken previously, including those reached at Washington.

Mr. HEURTEMATTE (IA-ECOSOC) wished to clarify his position. His instructions had been given in Washington by the Latin-American Governments only a fortnight previously. As the Brazilian delegation had pointed out, Governments might change their views, but a capital reason for those instructions had been the initiation of discussions between Mr. Prebisch and Mr. Lleras Camargo some months previously, though the Executive Secretary of ECLA had yet to meet Mr. Lleras Camargo

/in Washington

in Washington to agree on joint proposals.

Mr. PRIBISCH (Executive Secretary) said he wished to dispel the anxiety of the representative of IA-ECOSOC, who did not wish any resolution to be adopted which might tie his hands. After seeing the resolution presented, he felt the problem did not exist, as it did not tie his hands. Had it done so, he himself would have requested its withdrawal. He thought, on the contrary, that the resolution facilitated his action. By a process of elimination, it had been established that the only existing problem was that of overlapping of meetings. As a result of the Commission's indications regarding the calendar of meetings, the course of his negotiation was facilitated and he believed that the formula to be reached with Mr. Lleras Camargo would very probably be attained. He thought that the second section of the resolution did not attempt to advance solutions, but to propose a general formula which would clearly show up the only remaining problem. The request concerning the calendar gave elasticity to his negotiation. The solution could only arrive when he and Mr. Lleras Camargo submitted a formula to the two organizations.

/Mr. MARTINEZ

Mr. MARTINEZ (El Salvador) said that the Government of El Salvador welcomed the draft resolution. It considered ECLA to be an organization of the utmost value for the solving of Latin-American problems and the integration of Latin-American economy. To a small country with limited resources, the sending of experts to many conferences could be a heavy burden, and the proposals in the draft resolution for avoiding overlapping were welcome.

Mr. CRESPO ORDOÑEZ (Ecuador) saw no necessity for making an inventory of the work of ECLA, which had its own raison d'être. Countries could no longer plan their economies on a national basis; that of Latin America was bound up with Europe and must be considered as a whole. After some considerations on the importance of ECLA, he fully supported the draft resolution because in his opinion it strengthened the credentials of the Executive Secretary for his negotiations.

Mr. HUDICOURT (Haiti) recalled the decision at the previous meeting to abide by the recommendations made at the Fourth Session of ECLA in Mexico and at the second IA-ECOSOC Conference in Panama, on allowing the representatives of both bodies freedom to meet and put forward joint proposals. The draft resolution made no new recommendations, but gave the Executive Secretary of ECLA the general directions for which he had asked while leaving him liberty of action. It had the full support of the Haitian delegation.

The text, however, needed redrafting. ECLA had no power at all to alter its own structure, for it was simply an organism /set up

set up by United Nations. If the Economic and Social Council should see fit to alter its constitution, it had no choice but to abide by that decision. Paragraph 6 of section A should be amended to read: "RECOMMENDS" instead of "RESOLVES". In section C, the meaning of "the position taken by the Executive Secretary" should be clarified by adding: "as expressed in his statement", or "in the Secretariat's report".

Mr. SEPULVEDA (Chile), as co-sponsor of the draft resolution, accepted the amendments proposed by the Haitian delegation.

Mr. BOHAN (United States of America) said that careful study of the draft had convinced him that in substance it could further the unanimous desire for better co-ordination at all levels. The extent to which that co-ordination already existed at Secretariat level was a matter for congratulation to both organizations. As it stood, however, the wording of the draft resolution might create less rather than greater understanding. It might be rearrafted to take account of the recommendations made by the twenty-one governments meeting in Caracas some months previously, for whom the twenty-four governments meeting in Rio de Janeiro should not create problems. The final text should be as acceptable to IA-ECOSOC as to ECLA.

Mr. ALMEIDA (Brazil) welcomed any drafting amendments which delegates might make to the text of the draft resolutions. He wanted, however, to say that even though the delegate of Haiti had commented on the length of the resolution submitted to the Committee, he did not believe that that fact should in

/itself be

itself be construed as an objection to it. One single paragraph might be too much for a resolution and one hundred pages might be too little. It all depended on what had to be said.

The fact was that ECLA had become a permanent organ of the United Nations and the previous decisions which, so far, had been provisional in character, had now to assume necessarily a different character and should be reaffirmed as permanent decisions of the Commission. If the text seemed over-long, it was because of the intent to make references clear to those lacking the historical background with which the Committee was familiar.

He accepted the amendments suggested by the representative of Haiti to paragraph 6 of section A of the resolution, but wanted to clarify that the previous draft did not imply that the Commission had powers to change its own structure. It could, however, suggest to the ECOSOC whatever changes it deemed necessary and it was really in that spirit that the paragraph had been drafted previously.

He was grateful for the conditional support given to the draft resolution by the representative of the United States. The United States Government was among those most active in the matter of co-ordination and there was no doubt of its desire to co-operate. He wanted, however, to re-state that while the Brazilian Government would do everything to give full support to the activities of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council there was no reason now for future action on the status of ECLA to be hampered in any way.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN proposed that as all comment had been concerned only with the wording of the draft resolution, not with its substance, a small drafting committee should be established to amend the text in accordance with the suggestions put forward.

Mr. CRESPO ORDOÑEZ (Ecuador) and Mr. MARTINEZ (El Salvador) supported the proposal.

Mr. SILVERIO (Cuba) and Mr. AMADOR (Mexico) explained that they had abstained from taking part in the debate until a final text of the draft resolution, satisfactory to all delegations, had been prepared.

Mr. PORTELA (Argentina) asked that the Secretariat of ECLA should make available to any drafting committee which might be appointed an official statement on the position of the Executive Secretary for the purpose of clarifying the ante-penultimate paragraph of page 4 (English text).

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Secretariat might give the information to the Committee.

Mr. BOHAN (United States of America) reiterated his conviction that the existing wording of the text would tend to create difficulties in the way of co-ordination. All the countries represented were agreed in their support of ECLA. It had already been agreed that Mr. Probesch should be given complete freedom of negotiation, but there was no need to give the form of a resolution to the confidence which all felt in his consultation with the Secretary General of IA-ECOSOC.

Doubt might be cast on the accuracy of the third paragraph /of section C.

of section C. Any amendment could best be handled by a drafting committee, but should take note of the fact that the high officials representing the twenty-one governments participating in the conference at Caracas had expressed pleasure at the coordination already achieved, and agreed that, in passing resolutions, ECLA and IA-ECOSOC should ensure an absence of conflict and should keep them parallel.

Mr. CRESPO ORDOÑEZ (Ecuador) stated that a drafting committee could deal only with the wording of the draft resolution, while leaving its substance unchanged. In view of the issues raised by the United States delegation, it might be advisable to set up instead a working group in which the delegations which had debated the resolution might consult with the compilers.

Mr. PORTELA (Argentina) emphasized the intention of the draft resolution. Support of the Executive Secretary had already been approved, and his relations with the Secretary General of OAS had, throughout, been harmonious. All that the draft resolution proposed was to give some suggestions for his negotiations with Mr. Lleras Camargo.

Mr. ALMEIDA (Brazil) suggested that there was some inconsistency in the attitude of the United States delegation. In fact, the American representative had initially stated his acceptance of the substance of the joint proposal indicating only the need for some drafting changes; he now indicated his conviction that the existing wording would tend to create unsurmountable difficulties in the way of co-ordination.

Mr. Almeida could not see how problems of wording could in themselves create

themselves create difficulties of that nature. Drafting was very important, of course, in order to clarify concepts, but nothing else should be expected from a drafting committee, which should be very careful not to change the substance of a text about which there was already agreement. So, if the American representative thought that the joint text would create difficulties in the way of co-ordination it could not but be because he really disagreed with the substance of the proposal.

Another point which needed attention was that, since complete agreement with the substance of paragraph 5 of section "C" had been expressed, there could be no reason for deleting it from the text. If there was agreement on that paragraph, it was because it had a meaning. The agreement with its meaning involved necessarily its acceptance and any proposal to delete it seemed to contradict that agreement.

Finally, the United States representative who had been present in Mexico at the Fourth Session of ECLA could certainly not cast doubts on the accuracy of paragraph 3 of section "C". Its substance was confirmed on page 43 of document E/CN.12/266 of 15 June 1951. All that the authors of the draft resolution had done was to add the word "consecutive" to "joint and simultaneous sessions of ECLA", an addition that was wholly in accordance with the recommendation then made.

The debate had shown that some discussion of substance had become necessary before the text could be amended by a drafting committee. The Brazilian delegation did not think it advisable, however, to establish a working group for that purpose, since

/the full

the full committee itself was a rather reduced body, with some ten or twelve representatives only. It was a fact that in small groups it was possible to reach agreement more speedily than in bigger bodies, but experience shows that once the product of their work comes to the full committee discussion starts again on every detail of the documents, in full duplication of the work already performed. In those circumstances he suggested that the committee should try to reach agreement on the substance of the problem and only then send the proposals to a drafting committee.

Mr. CASAS BRICENO (Venezuela) pointed out some contradictions between paragraph 4 of section C and the resolutions issued by IA-ECOSOC in Panama and Caracas.

Mr. AMADOR (Mexico) said that, with certain amendments, the draft resolution was acceptable to the Mexican delegation. Paragraph 2 of section A was not accurate as a quotation from resolution 627 (VII) of the General Assembly of United Nations. Paragraph 3, describing the activities of ECLA, needed expansion. The following paragraph was redundant, while the last paragraph of section A was not a matter for resolution but for the expression of a hope; it might be deleted without loss.

The list of documents in section B was perhaps unnecessary, and in paragraph 2 of that section the quotation marks should be opened before the word "Co-ordination" if it were to be in keeping with the I.A.-ECOSOC resolution of 21 February 1953.

Paragraph 4 of section C was unnecessary - it merely /repeated the

repeated the substance of various documents - and no useful purpose was served by repeating in the third paragraph information contained in The Annual Report of the Economic Commission for Latin America (E/CN.12/266).

A point which needed further clarification was the form of support to be given to the Executive Secretary in his consultations with the Secretary General of IA-ECOSOC.

The penultimate paragraph of page 4 should refer only to economic conferences, not to all those to be held in Latin America. Nearly every international organization was included within the framework of the United Nations, which planned its programme of conferences with great care. A redrafted text might make it clear that the paragraph referred specifically to the Organization of American States.

Mr. GARRIDO (Dominican Republic) pointed out that, as it stood, the draft resolution had not one aim but many. It needed a lengthy study and adequate redrafting before being submitted for approval.

His delegation agreed with the representative of Haiti that ECLA had no power to take binding resolutions on its structure and organization. That must be done by the Economic and Social Council, which alone could decide whether it should be a temporary or permanent organization. Recommendations to the Economic and Social Council on the matter should be a separate document.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the speaker that the Economic and Social Council's recommendation that ECLA should be given /permanent status

permanent status had already been approved. It was now a standing commission of the United Nations.

Since the questions raised in the debate were mainly matters of drafting, he proposed the establishment of a working group to prepare a new text incorporating the proposed amendments. The group should be composed of the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, sponsors of the draft resolution, with those representatives who had contributed most to the discussion of its form - namely Mr. Martinez (El Salvador), Mr. Hudicourt (Haiti), Mr. Amador (Mexico) and Mr. Bohan (United States of America).

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.