

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL
E/CN.12/AC.23/SR.3
21 April 1953
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

COMMITTEE VI (Co-ordination)

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRD MEETING
Held at Rio de Janeiro on Tuesday, 21 April 1953,
at 4.40 p.m

CONTENTS:

Draft resolution approved by the Working Group
(Conference Room Paper No. 29)

/PRESENT:

PRESENT:

<u>Chairmen:</u>	Mr. NORIEGA MORALES	Guatemala
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. DE TINGUY DU POUET	France
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. PORTELA	Argentina
	Mr. DE ALMEIDA)	Brazil
	Mr. DE MOURA)	
	Mr. SEPULVEDA	Chile
	Mr. MEJIA	Colombia
	Mr. SILVERIO	Cuba
	Mr. GARRIDO	Dominican Republic
	Mr. CRESPO ORDÓÑEZ	Ecuador
	Mr. MARTINEZ MORENO	El Salvador
	Mr. CHARVET	France
	Mr. HUDECOURT)	Haiti
	Mr. RIGAUD)	
	Mr. AMADOR	Mexico
	Mr. CANTARERO	Nicaragua
	Mr. BARRETO	Peru
	Mr. BOHAN	United States of America
	Mr. ITURBIDE	Uruguay
	Mr. CASAS BRICCIANO	Venezuela

Also present:

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. DE SOUSA MONTEIRO	International Labour Organisation
-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Representatives

Representatives of an inter-governmental organization

Mr. HUERTEMATTE)	Inter-American
)	Economic and
Mr. TAYLOR)	Social Council

Secretariat:

Mr. PREBISCH	Executive Secretary
Mr. SWINSON	Assistant Director
Mr. SANTA CRUZ	Secretary of the Committee
Mr. MALINOWSKI	

DRAFT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE WORKING GROUP

(Conference Room Paper No. 29)

The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution before the Committee (Conference Room Paper No. 29) had met with the unanimous approval of the Working Group set up to draft it. The text was a tribute to their spirit of co-operation and hard work. Furthermore, from unofficial conversations, it appeared that the text also met with the approval of several other delegations not represented on the working group.

Mr. GARRIDO (Dominican Republic) considered that the final sentence of the last paragraph of the draft might lead to confusion, and suggested that it might be deleted, from the words "without prejudice ...".

The CHAIRMAN said that the paragraph had been included to prevent the recommendation from being too rigid, so that emergency situations might be covered.

Mr. PORTELA (Argentina) said that while the point raised by the representative of the Dominican Republic was pertinent, he accepted the Chairman's explanation.

Mr. MEJIA (Colombia) said he thought the time had come to remove the question of co-ordination from the agendas of both ECLA and IA-ECOSOC, as it had been raised for five years.

The two organizations had been set up to serve the Latin American countries, and both received full support from the governments concerned, because both were considered to be important to Latin America. To keep the matter on the agenda gave the impression that there was some disagreement, whereas that was not the case. On the basis of the documentation presented (E/CN.12/311) it was evident that those in charge of the two organizations were proceeding in the harmony and co-operation. He paid tribute to the work of both Dr. Prebisch and Mr. Lleras Camargo in their respective fields.

The draft resolution submitted was highly satisfactory, but there were a few questions which he wished to place before his colleagues. There was an international terminology dealing with the matters under discussion, and parts of the resolution were not in keeping with that terminology.

The first point he wished to raise was that of the use of the word organo in the Spanish text ("body" in the English version); he thought the Spanish word should be changed, and quoted from the Charter which listed the principal organs of the United Nations. In the economic field it was only the Economic and Social Council that was listed.

In that same considerandum on page 2 of the document, the words mantener y reforzar appeared, which he suggested should be changed to orientar. Alternatively, he felt that the whole section from "that it is a body ..." to the end of the paragraph, should be deleted.

With regard to the last paragraph of section A, he proposed reconsideration, or preferably deletion of the words "and that no changes in its structure and organization should prejudice the attainment of its objectives".

The final paragraph on page 3 (Spanish text) should be taken as a general principle for scheduling meetings and preventing overlapping. That paragraph tended to work against co-ordination, because if the two bodies were co-ordinated, and were carrying out different tasks, there could be no overlapping; the discussion of important problems should not be postponed merely to prevent meetings being held at close intervals. Such problems should be fully discussed, and discussed in due course.

/He explained

He explained the structure of IA-ECOSOC and the fact that extraordinary meetings were held whenever important policy questions arose. He therefore proposed that the specific reference to ECLA and IA-ECOSOC be deleted from the paragraph.

The word "negotiations" appearing in the two paragraphs on page 3 was perhaps too formal for the friendly arrangements between the Executive Secretary of ECLA and the Secretary General of IA-ECOSOC. He would prefer some word such as "conversations".

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Secretary of the Committee) replied that the word organo appeared in fact to be the proper one as the Commission was a subsidiary organ of the Economic and Social Council; he quoted Articles 7 (2) and 68 of the Charter of the United Nations to prove his point. The question of ECLA's ability to "maintain and strengthen" economic relations was fully in accordance with the Commission's terms of reference.

Mr. CASAS BRICENO (Venezuela) said he found the resolution rather lengthy and somewhat repetitious. In his view, the resolution had two aims, first to confirm permanent continuation of ECLA and to congratulate ECLA on its work and achievements, on which there was complete agreement regarding points formulated in the draft resolution; and second, to ensure the continuance of satisfactory co-ordination arrangements. He

/did not agree

did not agree with the representative of Colombia with regard to the question of scheduling meetings, as he considered that to be a basic part of the resolution.

Mr. MARTINEZ MORENO (El Salvador) and Mr. CRESPO ORDONEZ (Ecuador), while recognizing the right of delegations to criticize the work of the Working Group, expressed their surprise at hearing arguments put forward which had been thoroughly ventilated during previous meetings and meetings of the Working Group and felt that the resolution should be put to the vote as submitted by the working group.

Mr. DE ALMEIDA (Brazil) pointed out that delegations had had an opportunity for expressing their views previously, and only when the conclusion had been reached on the substance of the resolution which necessarily involved the operative part, had it been decided to set up a working group to draw up a final draft which would be acceptable to all. Any changes in the essential part of the text should therefore have been made before the working group was set up. The Colombian proposal appeared to involve complete re-orientation of the work done, and he regretted that this delegation could not fully agree with the draft resolution submitted to the Committee.

Mr. PORTELA (Argentina) supported the Brazilian view, and explained that there had been no question of presenting the

Committee with a fait accompli. The sole purpose of the draft resolution was to facilitate the harmonious work of the two organizations mentioned therein.

Mr. GARRIDO (Dominican Republic) said he understood the question of scheduling to mean preventing repetition of subject matter, and ensuring adequate intervals between major meetings.

Mr. HUDICOURT (Haiti) said that the Colombian criticisms regarding substance would remove the very meaning and purpose from the draft resolution, and suggested that the representative of Colombia should reconsider his position, which was not shared by other delegations; he would render a service to the Committee by withdrawing his proposal on substantive changes. Consideration should perhaps be given to some modifications of style and terminology.

Mr. MEJIA (Colombia) said that while he could not approve the resolution as it stood, he wished to make it clear that there should be no modification in its structure, but rather that some of the wording should be changed. He proposed therefore that the resolution be voted on paragraph by paragraph, and that finally there be a vote on the whole text.

Mr. CASAS BRICEÑO (Venezuela) confirmed his previous proposal, although his doubts on the question of scheduling had been partly removed by the representative of Colombia.

/Mr. DE MOURA

Mr. DE MOURA (Brazil) pointed out that the Colombian proposal for the last paragraph on page three would frustrate the whole object of the resolution, since the item on the agenda related specifically to co-ordination between ECLA and IA-ECOSOC.

After some discussion on the voting procedure to be adopted, it was agreed to vote first on each paragraph and then on the resolution as a whole.

Mr. SILVERIO (Cuba) said that he being also a chairman of IA-ECOSOC, would abstain from voting, following the position he had adopted in plenary, but reserved his right to make a statement on the subject at a later stage.

The CHAIRMAN put the first paragraph to the vote.

The first paragraph was approved.

The CHAIRMAN put the second paragraph to the vote.

The second paragraph was approved.

The CHAIRMAN put the third paragraph to the vote, subject to a drafting amendment proposed by Mexico.

The third paragraph was unanimously approved, with the Mexican amendment to insert the words "with equal satisfaction" after the words "HAVING NOTED".

The CHAIRMAN put the Colombian amendments to the fourth paragraph to the vote. The amendments were to delete the words que es un organo que, secondly to insert the word "orientar" instead of the phrase "mantener y reforzar".

The fourth paragraph, with these two amendments, was approved.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN then put the fifth paragraph to the vote.
The fourth paragraph was approved, with two abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put the sixth paragraph to the vote,
subject to a drafting amendment proposed by El Salvador.

The sixth paragraph was approved with El Salvador's amendment to insert the words "dicho" before the word "Consejo" in line 4.

The CHAIRMAN put the seventh paragraph to the vote.
The seventh paragraph was approved.

The CHAIRMAN put the eighth paragraph to the vote.
The eighth paragraph was approved.

The CHAIRMAN put the ninth paragraph to the vote,
subject to a drafting amendment proposed by Venezuela.

The ninth paragraph was approved, with the Venezuelan amendment to insert the words "at the Secretariat level" instead of "at that level" in line five.

The CHAIRMAN put the tenth paragraph to the vote,
subject to a drafting amendment proposed by Haiti.

The tenth paragraph was approved with the Haitian amendment to replace the words "a fin de lograr" by "a fin de que se logre" in line four.

After some discussion, the representatives of Venezuela and Colombia proposed amendments to the eleventh paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN put the Venezuelan amendment that introduced a complete new text for the eleventh paragraph to the vote.

The Venezuelan amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN put the Colombian amendment to the
/eleventh paragraph

eleventh paragraph to delete the words especialmente las de la CEPAL y el CIES to the vote.

The Colombian amendment to the eleventh paragraph was rejected by a show of hands, three votes being cast in favour.

Discussion followed on the use of the words "conferencias principales", since the word "conferences" had a particular connotation in international terminology.

The CHAIRMAN suggested the use of the words reuniones principales instead.

The change was accepted.

The CHAIRMAN put the eleventh paragraph to the vote, subject to the following drafting amendments: the inclusion of the words que la programación de should follow the word CONSIDERA and the replacement of the words conferencias principales by reuniones principales.

The eleventh paragraph with the two drafting amendments was approved.

Mr. AMADOR (Mexico) proposed two drafting amendments to the twelfth paragraph, namely the use of the word conversaciones instead of negociaciones, and the words como queda resumida instead of expresada. He proposed at the same time that the word conversaciones be used instead of negociaciones in the final paragraph.

Mr. CASAS BRICEÑO (Venezuela) proposed the addition of the words que al respecto ha llevado after the word conversaciones proposed by Mexico in the twelfth paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN put the Mexican amendments to the twelfth

/paragraph to

paragraph to the vote.

The Mexican amendments to the twelfth paragraph were approved.

The CHAIRMAN put the Venezuelan amendment to the twelfth paragraph to the vote.

The Venezuelan amendment to the twelfth paragraph was approved by 8 votes to 4.

Mr. MEJIA (Colombia) proposed the deletion of the final paragraph of the draft resolution, since he considered it misleading and repetitious, particularly in view of the confidence of all delegations in the wisdom of the Executive Secretary of ECLA. The subject was fully clarified in previous paragraphs of the draft resolution. Any addition such as in the last paragraph would unnecessarily tie the words of Dr. Prebisch and Dr. Lleras.

Mr. DE MOURA (Brazil) opposed the Colombian proposal on the grounds that it would weaken the position of the Executive Secretary of ECLA and the Secretary General of IA-ECOSOC to take decisions in cases of urgency and he considered the paragraph of great importance as a guidance in the consultations, being the conclusion of previous paragraphs.

Mr. ITURBIDE (Uruguay) proposed that Dr. Prebisch and Dr. Lleras Camargo be mentioned by name in that final paragraph, as a tribute to their outstanding qualities and work.

Mr. GARRIDO (Dominican Republic) supported the Uruguayan proposal.

Mr. PREBISCH (Economic Commission for Latin America)

/thanked the

thanked the delegates for the honour they had shown him, but said he did not consider that names should be included in the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN put the Colombian proposal to delete the entire thirteenth paragraph to the vote.

The Colombian proposal was rejected unanimously.

Mr. MEJIA (Colombia) proposed an amended text for the thirteenth paragraph.

Mr. HUDICOURT (Haiti) on a point of order, enquired whether it was possible to make a second proposal which had virtually the same aim as the previous proposal of the representative of Colombia, which had been rejected by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN put the second Colombian proposal, to amend the thirteenth paragraph, to the vote.

The second Colombian proposal was rejected, to amend the thirteenth paragraph, only one vote being cast in favour.

Mr. BOHAN (United States) said that he had not voted for the second Colombian proposal as his delegation had already explained its position on the draft resolution in the working group.

The CHAIRMAN put the Uruguayan proposal, to include personal names in the thirteenth paragraph, to the vote.

The Uruguayan proposal was rejected by a show of hands, two votes being cast in its favour.

Several delegations explained that they had voted against the proposal in view of the need to give clear guidance to Dr.

Prehisch in his consultations with Dr. Lleras as requested by the former, understanding this paragraph as an important operative part of the resolution, as well as in view of unanimous approval of that and previous paragraphs and the resolution as a whole by the working group, which wanted to eliminate any doubt regarding to wishes of the Commission in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN put the thirteenth paragraph to the vote, subject to two drafting amendments, arising out of identical changes in wording made in previous paragraphs.

The thirteenth paragraph, with the following amendments: "conversaciones" replacing the word "negociaciones" and "reuniones" replacing the word "conferencias", was approved by a show of hands with three abstentions.

Mr. SILVERIO (Cuba) proposed that the vote on the resolution as a whole be taken by roll-call, in view of the fact that the resolution called for a solution of co-ordination at the government level.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution to the vote.

The draft resolution was approved by 13 votes in favour (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, the United States of America, France, Haiti, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Dominican Republic, Uruguay) with 3 abstentions (Colombia, Cuba and Venezuela) .

Mr. MARTINEZ MORENO (El Salvador) said he had been asked by the representative of Costa Rica to add that country's

/support to

support to the draft resolution prepared by the Working Group.

Mr. CASAS BRICEÑO (Venezuela) and Mr. MEJIA (Colombia) explained that their abstentions were due to the lack of specific instructions from their governments.

Mr. SILVERIO (Cuba) said that his delegation regretted having to abstain from voting, in the first place he understood that the fact the IA-ECOSOC and ECLA meetings may be held either "jointly, consecutively and in the same place" as suggested by Dr. Lleras Camargo, or else by preventing overlapping meetings of the two organizations as suggested by Dr. Prebisch and the Commission, did not mean that the problem of co-ordination at the government level which was under study, had been entirely solved as might be deduced from perusal of paragraph four of document E/CN.12/311/Add.1, in relation to the penultimate paragraph of Conference Room Paper No 29, in which that document was noted with approval.

His delegation also considered that it might have been worth while for the Committee to make a statement on its interpretation regarding the achievement of the type of collaboration at the secretariat level set forth in Mexico by ECLA and accepted by IA-ECOSOC at Panama. His delegation considered that the omission of a point which it considered to be of the greatest importance, was a further reason for abstention.

The delegation of Cuba thought it desirable to clarify:

a) That since the foundation of ECLA, for which it was to a large extent responsible, the Government of Cuba had,

/within the

within the United Nations, given its fullest support to ECLA, because it considered that it was useful for the economic future of the continent. His country fully upheld that position and would undoubtedly continue to do so in future;

b) That was the case because the government and people of Cuba considered ECLA to be one of the most dynamic advantageous and best prepared bodies for studying and orienting the economic problems and policies of Latin American Countries particularly in the field of economic development;

c) That the Inter-American Economic and Social Council was a substantial part of the Organization of American States which, in turn, gave its Member States the most direct and objective guarantees of the existence of a juridically articulated system which enabled them, in conjunction with other international organizations, including ECLA, to find an over-all solution to political, economic and social problems arising in the continent. Therefore his delegation was also decidedly in favour of consolidating its structure, prestige and future;

d) That the Government of Cuba was fully aware of the close relationship and mutual interdependence between the activities of the United Nations and of those of the Organization of American States, and was certain that very few activities of collective utility could be achieved by the two organizations unless there was a clear, decisive, disinterested and perspicacious system of co-operation and co-ordination between them and their specialized agencies and commissions, which included among their terms of reference other provisions not considered at the

/meeting in

meeting in progress;

e) That his delegation was sure that Mr. Prebisch and Dr. Lleras, both of whom were statesmen with a clear awareness and understanding of the factors having a bearing on the matter, would find adequate means for reaching advantageous agreement for co-ordination at the government level and for collaboration at the secretariat level between their respective organisations.

The Delegation of Cuba desired to place on record that when the problem was discussed by IA-ECOSOC, it had supported the view that the meetings of IA-ECOSOC and ECLA should be held at suitable intervals, but without relating that question too closely with that affecting the problem of co-ordination at the government level, for the reasons previously given, and also because it had felt then, and continued to consider, that that measure was rather intended to solve the question of the plurality of conferences in Latin America which only had salient angles in common with the question under discussion.

He requested that his statement be included verbatim in the record of the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN speaking as representative of Guatemala, said that his delegation had not voted on the resolution, but would give its confirmative vote in plenary.

He asked whether delegations wished to hold another meeting to prepare a report for the plenary, or whether they were in favour of authorizing the Rapporteur to describe the facts and take the resolution, without including any controversial matters in

/his report,

his report, to the plenary; the statement by the Cuban representative would be included in the summary record.

The CHAIRMAN's suggestions were supported by the representatives of the Dominican Republic and of Ecuador.

The CHAIRMAN put his second suggestion to the vote.

It was decided that the matter be placed before the plenary by the Rapporteur without holding a special meeting of the Committee to approve this report.

The meeting rose at 9.15 p.m.