



UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

E/CN.12/AC.52/SR.2  
6 September 1962

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Ninth Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 6 June 1962, at 3.35 p.m.

CONTENTS

Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning  
(consideration of the proposals made by the Secretariat of  
the Commission with respect to certain parts of  
resolution 218 (AC.50)) (E/CN.12/AC.52/2/Rev.1) (continued)

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. ESCOBAR CERDA	(Chile)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. GARCIA REYNOSO	Mexico
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. BERNARDO	Argentina
	Mr. GALARZA	Bolivia
	Mr. ROUANET	Brazil
	Mr. BARTON	Canada
	Mr. SOMAVIA	Chile
	Mr. PATIÑO	Colombia
	Mr. JIMENEZ	Costa Rica
	Mr. PRIMELLES	Cuba
	Mr. HERERRA	Dominican Republic
	Mr. SALGADO	Ecuador
	Mr. VIDUARRE	El Salvador
	Mr. LISETTE	France
	Mr. FLORES AVEDAÑO)	Guatemala
	Mr. GONZALEZ-PRADO)	
	Mr. DORSINVILLE	Haiti
	Mr. CACERES-PINEDA	Honduras
	Mr. LUBBERS	Netherlands
	Mr. SAMUDIO	Panama
	Mr. LOPEZ	Paraguay
	Mr. FERNANDINI	Peru
	Miss SALT	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. FINER	United States of America
	Mr. VELAZQUEZ	Uruguay
	Mr. DORANTE	Venezuela

Representatives of States Members of the United Nations not members of  
the Commission, attending in a consultative capacity:

Mr. CHERNYSHEV)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. PROKOFYEV )	

PRESENT (continued):

Representatives of States not Members of the United Nations, attending in a consultative capacity:

Mr. BRUNNER	Federal Republic of Germany
Mr. HEGNER	Switzerland

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. BUSTAMANTE)	International Labour
Mr. REYMOND )	Organisation (ILO)
Mr. ORR	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Mr. DIEZ-HOCKLEZTNER	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
Mr. MURRAY ROSS	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)
Dr. SUTTER	World Health Organization (WHO)

Representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency:

Mr. BURT

Representatives of inter-governmental organizations:

Mr. COPETE	Inter-American Development Bank
Mr. LASOCKI)	Inter-Governmental Committee for
Mrs. TROPIN)	European Migration (ICEM)

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category A: Mrs. LUSARDI International Chamber of  
Commerce (ICC)

Category B: Mr. SARGENT Inter-American Council of Commerce  
and Production (IACCP)

Secretariat:

Mr. PREBISCH	Executive Secretary
Mr. HEURTEMATTE	Associate Managing Director of the Special Fund
Mr. GOLDSCHMIDT	Director for Special Fund activities
Mr. MALINOWSKI	Secretary of the Economic and Social Council
Mr. SANTA CRUZ	Secretary of the Committee

LATIN AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PLANNING (CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSALS MADE BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN PARTS OF RESOLUTION 218 (AC.50)) (E/CN.12/AC.52/2/Rev.1) (continued)

Mr. DIEZ-HOCHLEZTNER (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning was of particular importance for UNESCO, which had always been interested in promoting educational development in close relationship with economic and social development plans. It had been agreed that a special Educational Planning Section would be established within the Institute. As a preliminary step, a three-month course on educational planning was being organized by UNESCO and the Institute, with the co-operation of the ILO and IDA. UNESCO was glad to have the opportunity of making a useful contribution to the work of the Institute and was prepared to share the experience and technical resources which it possessed in the field of educational planning. It had been working in that field since 1958 when, in co-sponsorship with OAS, UNESCO had organized the first American seminar on the over-all planning of education which had been followed by national courses conducted by UNESCO experts in several countries of Latin America. UNESCO was continually emphasizing the need to integrate educational planning within economic and social planning, an idea which had been unanimously accepted at the Conference on Education and Economic and Social Development in Latin America, held at Santiago in March 1962. In order to achieve such integration, UNESCO had established regional training centres for educational planners in Africa, Asia and the Arab countries. His organization could effectively contribute to the work of the Institute and, in particular, to the training of educational planners with a good basic knowledge of the principles and techniques of over-all economic development. In its twenty-sixth report (E/3625), the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination had mentioned that there would be consultations with the specialized agencies concerned regarding the organization and programme of the Institute. In addition, the Executive Board of UNESCO had expressed its interest in the project and emphasized the need for close co-operation with ECLA.

UNESCO had noted the amendment to resolution 218 (AC.50) proposed by the Secretariat (E/CN.12/AC.52/2/Rev.1). He wished to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that mention had been made of giving representation on the governing bodies of the Institute to economic and financial organizations; the Institute's title, however, indicated that it was also responsible for social planning. As

(Mr. Diez-Hochleztner, UNESCO)

one of the international organizations working in Latin America in the field of economic and social development, UNESCO too should be represented on the organs of the Institute in the interest of continuity and co-ordination, not only at the technical level, but also at the policy level.

Mr. ORR (Food and Agriculture Organization) wished to express his organization's interest in being closely associated with the work of the Institute. That interest arose from FAO's responsibilities in the field of planning for agricultural development, which should be viewed in the context of over-all planning for economic and social development. Conversely, and especially in agricultural countries, over-all development programmes should devote considerable attention to the agricultural sector. In its twenty-sixth report, the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination had considered the question of the relationship of the specialized agencies to regional development institutes (E/3625, paragraphs 176 and 177). FAO considered that it should have at least an advisory voice in the functioning of the Institute and should therefore be represented on the Advisory Committee.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE (International Labour Organisation) stressed ILO's support for the Institute, which had already been expressed at the thirty-third session of the Economic and Social Council. His organization could make an important contribution to the work of the Institute and the wide co-operation existing between ECLA and the ILO, which had participated in the activities of the Advisory Groups and in training courses, should be continued. The best way to achieve that end would be for the ILO to be represented on the Advisory Committee, since it could make an important contribution, for example, in the field of manpower and human resources.

Dr. SUTTER (World Health Organization) said that the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, which was WHO's regional office for the America, desired to co-operate in the activities of the Institute. The Organization of American States (OAS) recognized in its Charter the importance of health and had adopted a resolution on the use of the advisory services of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau in national health plans. At least thirty-one countries had already requested advice and it was expected that more countries would do the same. In that connexion, the Bureau would hold a yearly course for health planners and would award fellowships. Health plans should be co-ordinated with the other aspects of,

(Dr. Sutter, WHO)

economic and social development and the Bureau should therefore maintain a close relationship with the proposed Institute.

Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) said that his delegation's reservations on the subject of the functions and composition of the Governing Council had been dispelled by the explanation given by the Executive Secretary, who had said that the representation of the Inter-American Development Bank on the Governing Council was unconnected with the fact that the Bank made a substantial financial contribution to the Institute and had confirmed that the establishment of development plans would remain the primary responsibility of the Governments concerned. In the light of those explanations, however, the Argentine delegation had submitted amendments to resolution 218 (AC.50), which were contained in Conference Room Paper No. 4. The Inter-American Development Bank should be able to give the Governing Council the benefit of its experience; it should therefore participate in the Governing Council's discussions, but without the right to vote, as stated in the Argentine amendment to sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 3 of part A. Sub-paragraph (c) of that paragraph would then have to be amended to establish the procedure for the election of the eight elected members. In that connexion, he would stress that giving the right to vote to the representatives of organizations would give the latter a disproportionate say in the Institute's work.

His delegation wished to insert a reference to the Inter-American Development Bank in paragraph 5 of part B of resolution 218 (AC.50). The Bank should be informed of the use being made of the funds that it supplied and, in that respect, should have similar status to the Special Fund. It would thus have a double check on the use of those funds, by its participation in the discussions of the Governing Council and by the direct information that the Director-General of the Institute would have to supply. That amendment would be in line with the desire of the representatives of Haiti and the United States to include in the text a reference to all the international organizations represented on the Governing Council.

Mr. ROUANET (Brazil) said that his delegation would prefer to retain the original paragraph 3 (a). It had misgivings about the Secretariat amendment, which represented a substantial departure from the original text, and it supported the Argentine amendment, which suitably reconciled the different points of view. Its doubts about the representation of the Inter-American Development Bank on the

(Mr. Rouanet, Brazil)

Governing Council had been dispelled by the explanation given by the Executive Secretary. The Brazilian delegation agreed with the representatives of Haiti and the United States about the list of the international organizations to be represented on the Governing Council. Only elected members should vote, but that did not prevent the appointed members from participating in discussions. His delegation supported the Argentine amendment to paragraph 5 of part B of resolution 218 (AC.50), since the Inter-American Development Fund should receive the same treatment as the Special Fund.

Mr. PRIMELLES (Cuba) reminded the members of the Committee of the position adopted by his delegation at Santiago, when it had been agreed to establish the Institute. The Cuban delegation had no objection to the amendments proposed by the Secretariat and the delegation of Colombia. However, it did have objections to the Argentine amendments. Cuba had been illegally and unjustly excluded from the Organization of American States, which no longer truly represented the interests of the Latin American countries. His delegation therefore opposed the Argentine amendment to sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 3 of part A, in so far as it concerned the OAS. For the same reason, it opposed the United States suggestion to include on the Governing Council one member appointed by the Secretary-General of the OAS.

Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) said that he was under the impression that the question of the representation of the Inter-American Development Bank on the Governing Council had been agreed at Santiago, although not specifically mentioned in resolution 218 (AC.50). He was therefore surprised at the fact that amendments had been submitted aimed at establishing a second category of representatives without the right to vote and that certain delegations appeared to doubt the Bank's role in promoting economic development. Latin America had waited a long time for the creation of the Bank, which was playing an increasingly important role in the development of that continent. It was obvious to his delegation that the Inter-American Development Bank, the OAS and ECLA should be given in the management of the Institute a role proportionate to the importance of the aid which they gave to that body and of their activities to promote the economic development of Latin America. The Colombian delegation was therefore unable to accept the Argentine amendments.

Mr. GALARZA (Bolivia) could not support the Argentine amendments, because they contradicted the substance of resolution 218 (AC.50). The Institute was to be established under the auspices of ECLA, but the Argentine delegation wanted to deprive ECLA of the right to vote in the Governing Council.

In the opinion of the Bolivian delegation, the Institute should train the personnel needed by Latin American countries to solve their economic and social development problems and should advise on programmes, plans and projects to ensure the growth of national economies. It should make a rational analysis of the theory of development and the techniques to overcome under-development. It was to be hoped that the Institute would expand its activities and concentrate ultimately on fixing the general lines of the development policy to be followed by Latin American countries. The Institute should be the pivot around which would revolve the efforts of all the institutions working to promote the development of Latin America. His delegation supported the Secretariat amendment, because it was in line with that concept of the Institute's functions.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) agreed with the representative of Bolivia that the Committee was drifting into a debate on the substance of the question. The Argentine amendments were a departure from the views expressed at Santiago regarding the eleven representatives on the Governing Council. His delegation could not support those amendments, because the establishment of different categories of representatives, giving an inferior status to the three representatives of international organizations, reopened the important question of the nature of the representation. He would be unable to speak on that matter, since he had received instructions only on the resolution and amendments under discussion.

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) agreed that it would not be advisable to give secondary status to members of the Governing Council that had already been granted equal representation. His delegation supported the Secretariat amendment and would be able to support the Argentine amendment to sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 3 of part A only if the words "without the right to vote" were deleted. The functions of the Governing Council, as established in paragraph 2 of part A



(Mr. Finger, United States)

of the resolution, were not matters in which a vote was usually taken. In any case, if the representatives of organizations such as ECLA, the OAS and the IADB were strongly opposed to a particular proposal, it would probably be unwise for the Institute to ignore their viewpoint. He hoped that the Argentine delegation would not insist on establishing two different categories of representation. His delegation would not object to the Argentine amendment to sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 3 of part A, although it might be preferable to use the word "re-appoint" rather than "re-elect" at the end of the sub-paragraph. Nor did it object to the Argentine amendment to paragraph 5 of part B. However, the original text of paragraph 5 in resolution 218 (AC.50) had spoken of "the provisions of the Special Fund project". He was not certain whether the statute of the Inter-American Development Bank would require a direct report to the executing agency. The United States delegation appreciated the financial contribution made by the Inter-American Development Bank, but thought that it was not the most important factor involved.

Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) saw no reason why the Inter-American Development Bank should not be represented in the Governing Council on a footing of equality. He preferred the Secretariat amendments as they stood.

Mr. GARCIA REYNOSO (Mexico) observed that the Argentine amendment to paragraph 3 (a) of operative part A differed from the corresponding Secretariat amendment in that it expressly mentioned ECLA and the OAS, altered the basis of representation in the Governing Council previously agreed upon, and introduced the principle of membership without the right to vote. He recalled that earlier in the discussion, when the express mention of the Inter-American Development Bank in the Secretariat amendment was defended on the narrow ground of the Bank's financial contribution to the Institute, one representative had noted that that had nothing in common with the basis of representation in the Governing Council agreed upon at the last session after a long and difficult debate.

It seemed to him that, before voting on the amendments under consideration, members of the Committee should decide to what extent they wished to reopen certain questions which had been settled at Santiago.

/...

The CHAIRMAN expressed the view that the very fact of consideration of amendments to a resolution that had been adopted reopened the debate on any question dealt with by the resolution.

Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) observed that it was certainly not his delegation which had reopened the debate on the Institute. Agreement on the way in which the Institute would operate had been reached at Santiago; the debate had been reopened by those who had asked the present session to consider amendments; and his delegation had, in its turn, presented amendments with a view to clarifying the issues and restoring unanimity.

In reply to some of the comments on the Argentine amendments he said that he was sure his Colombian colleague would not wish the Committee simply to "rubber-stamp" important amendments in order not to prolong its deliberations.

With regard to the Bolivian representative's remarks, he pointed out that the representative of ECLA in the Governing Council would presumably represent the Secretariat of ECLA rather than the Commission itself. The position of ECLA in the formulation of the Institute's policies would be safeguarded by the eight voting members of the Council, for it was ECLA that would elect them. The fact that the representative of the ECLA secretariat could not vote would therefore not be a capitis diminutio of the Commission. He did not think that the representatives of the international organizations should, or would wish to, take part in decisions of the Governing Council. Their function was to contribute the specialized knowledge and experience of their organizations. Indeed, they might find themselves in an embarrassing position if required to vote, or even to abstain from the vote, on certain political questions.

As to the observations of the representatives of Haiti and the United States of America, he said that his delegation would have had no difficulty in accepting resolution 218 (AC.50) as it stood. He regretted that he could not comply with the United States representative's suggestion to delete the words "without vote" from the Argentine amendment, for that would defeat the very purpose of the amendment. On that question, he would be interested to hear the views of the ECLA Secretariat and the Inter-American Development Bank.

/...

Mr. PREBISCH (Executive Secretary) said that the Argentine representative was correct in assuming that the representative of ECLA in the Governing Council would be appointed by the Secretariat of ECLA. As to the question of his voting, it should be borne in mind that the representatives of the international organizations in the Council would be there in an eminently technical capacity, namely, that of giving the other members the benefit of their organizations' experience.

It seemed to him that an argument against their right to vote could only be made out if they had a role which overlapped the more or less political functions of the other members of the Council. That, however, was not the case.

Mr. COPETE (Inter-American Development Bank) reviewed the functions of the Inter-American Development Bank as laid down in its Statutes, which had been duly approved by the American Governments in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures.

When the idea of a Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning was first put forward, it had been enthusiastically welcomed by the responsible officers of the Bank, and the Bank was at present under instructions from its governing body to support the Institute to be established under the aegis of ECLA. It was gratifying to note the general understanding that the Bank's participation in the Institute would be based not on its financial contribution alone but also on the ground of its special interest in economic development in Latin America and, therefore, of the contribution it could make in the realm of principles and ideas.

In view of that consideration, he did not think that the Bank's participation in the Governing Council should be limited. The Bank wished to be allowed to play a full part in the work of the Institute and to make a maximum contribution of its moral, technical and financial resources, without reservations and without restrictions.

Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) said that he was more than willing to see the Committee discuss at length any matter of substance. At the last session there had been a division between the delegations which had held that all decisions concerning the policies of the Institute should be made by representatives of

(Mr. Patiño, Colombia)

Governments and those delegations which had taken a less rigid position. Since that problem had been resolved and did not enter into the question under consideration at present and since he was sure that all delegations, including the Argentine delegation, agreed that the Inter-American Development Bank had an important part to play in the direction of the Institute, he was at a loss to understand what question of principle was at issue.

Mr. SALGADO (Ecuador) said that the Argentine amendment to paragraph 3 (a) appeared to be based on the assumption that eight members of the Governing Council would represent Governments and would therefore be in a higher category than the three remaining members. Actually that was not the case, for the eight would be serving as individuals. He supported the approach in the corresponding Secretariat amendment, because the Inter-American Development Bank would have a major technical contribution to make and should therefore be permanently represented. The two other international organizations could be represented if and as they were needed.

As to the second Argentine amendment, modifying paragraph 3 (c) of operative part A, he felt that it would be better to leave it to the three international organizations to appoint their representatives in accordance with their respective statutes. Similarly, there was no need for the Argentine amendment to paragraph 5 of operative part B, since the question of reporting would undoubtedly be dealt with in the Institute's agreement with the Inter-American Development Bank.

Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) thanked the Executive Secretary and the representative of the Inter-American Development Bank for their explanations and their cogent arguments. He was also impressed by the arguments just put forward by the representative of Ecuador. Although he could defend his delegation's amendments as in no way conflicting with those arguments, he felt that it would be best, in the circumstances, to withdraw the Argentine amendments. He wished to thank those delegations which had supported them in whole or in part, and he regretted that his instructions would not enable him to support certain parts of the Secretariat amendments.

The CHAIRMAN congratulated the representative of Argentina on the spirit of conciliation and co-operation he had shown. He noted that the United States delegation had presented its amendments in Conference Room Paper No. 3 as "informal suggestions", and asked whether the sponsor wished them to be put to the vote.

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) felt that it would expedite matters if the United States amendments were considered formally. In the light of the discussion, however, he wished to retain the wording at the end of paragraph 3 (a), operative part A, of resolution 218 (AC.50).

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Secretary) read out the following revised text of the United States sub-amendment to the Secretariat amendment to paragraph 3 (a) (E/CN.12/AC.52/2/Rev.1):

"In paragraph 3 (a), line 4, delete the text after the words 'Inter-American Development Bank' and substitute the following text: 'one member shall be appointed by the Secretary-General of the OAS and one member shall represent the Secretariat of ECLA as international organizations working in the economic and financial field in Latin America'".

Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) supported the United States sub-amendment.

The United States sub-amendment was adopted by 14 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

The Secretariat amendment to paragraph 3 (a) of operative part A of resolution 218 (AC.50) was adopted, as amended, by 20 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Secretary) read out the following text of the United States sub-amendment to the Secretariat amendment (E/CN.12/AC.52/2/Rev.1) proposing the addition of a fifth paragraph to operative part A of resolution 218 (AC.50):

"In paragraph 5, line 3, add after the words 'Inter-American Development Bank' the following:

'a representative appointed by the OAS'".

The United States sub-amendment was adopted by 19 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

The Secretariat amendment adding a fifth paragraph to operative part A of resolution 218 (AC.50) was adopted, as amended, by 22 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the fact that, in addition to the Secretariat's proposed amendment to paragraph 4 (e) of resolution 218 (AC.50), which had been circulated in Conference Room Paper No. 1, a further amendment to the same paragraph had been submitted by the Colombian delegation and had been circulated in Conference Room Paper No. 2. He invited the Committee to consider the Colombian amendment which read as follows:

"Amend paragraph 4 (e) to read as follows:

'To conclude with Governments and with other national or international agencies such contracts or other arrangements as may be necessary for making available the services of the Institute.'

Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia), replying to a question by Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina), said that his delegation's amendment provided for the conclusion of contracts or arrangements with "national agencies" because that had been deemed a desirable additional facility. The Institute's relations would normally be with Governments, but in certain countries where the constitutional or administrative systems so required the Institute would necessarily have to deal with other entities. His delegation would be prepared to accept any rewording of its amendment which did not modify the substance.

Mr. GALARAZA (Bolivia) inquired whether it was intended that contracts or other arrangements might be concluded with national agencies without consultation of the Government concerned.

Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) said that a situation might well arise where such consultation would not be necessary and the Institute should therefore have legal authority to contract with entities other than Governments.

Mr. BARTON (Canada) suggested that the case might arise where contracts would have to be concluded for the provision of services to the Institute. The Colombian text might be amended by replacing the words "for making available the services of the Institute" by the words "in connexion with the functions of the Institute".

Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) objected to the idea of the Institute circumventing the Government of the country concerned. He therefore hoped that the Colombian delegation might agree to withdraw its amendment.

Mr. GALARAZA (Bolivia) pointed out that operative paragraph 1 of part A of the resolution made the Institute responsible for providing the services only "at the request of the Governments concerned". For that reason, his delegation opposed the idea of contracts between the Institute and national agencies in the private sector. It preferred the amendment submitted by the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, while a Government might request the Institute to provide services, the need might arise for the Institute to conclude contracts or arrangements with national agencies for the purpose of meeting the request.

Mr. GALARAZA (Bolivia) agreed with the Chairman, but felt that that point should be made clear in the amendment.

Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) saw no need to amplify his delegation's amendment by including something which was stated in operative paragraph 1 of the resolution.

Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) proposed that the Colombian text should be amended to read:

"To conclude with Governments and with international agencies such contracts or other arrangements as may be necessary for making available the services of the Institute to Governments and to national agencies."

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) proposed the addition, at the end of the Colombian text, of the words "It being understood that arrangements with national agencies shall be made in consultation with the Governments concerned".

Mr. GARCIA REYNOSO (Mexico) said that a series of detailed contracts might need to be concluded with national agencies in implementation of an agreement with a Government. He therefore proposed that the Colombian text should be amended to read:

"To conclude with Governments and, where appropriate, to enter into such contracts or other arrangements with other national or international agencies, as may be necessary for making available the services of the Institute."

Mr. SALGADO (Ecuador) said that operative paragraph 4 of part A of the resolution merely specified the duties and functions of the Director-General of the Institute. In his administrative and executive capacity, the latter could make such arrangements with non-governmental entities as might be required. He therefore saw no need to include the words "with Governments" in paragraph 4 (e).

Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) said that, of the various amendments to his delegation's text which had been proposed, he preferred that of Mexico.

Mr. FINGER (United States of America) revised his delegation's proposed addition to the Colombian text, to read as follows: "... It being understood that arrangements with national agencies shall be made with the approval of the Governments concerned".

Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) accepted that addition to the amendment submitted by his delegation.

Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) said that his delegation, like that of Argentina, preferred the amendment to paragraph 4 (a), which had been proposed by the Secretariat.

Mr. VELAZQUEZ (Uruguay) said that the Committee should vote first on the Secretariat's amendment to paragraph 4 (a) since it had priority.

The CHAIRMAN said that the rules of procedure required a vote to be taken first on the amendment furthest removed from the original text. He therefore invited the Committee to vote on the Colombian amendment which now incorporated the addition proposed by the United States representative.

The Colombian amendment was adopted by 12 votes to 6, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN said that delegations wishing to explain their vote would be given an opportunity to do so at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.