

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL
E/CN.12/AC.42/SR.5
22 May 1959

ORIGINAL ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA
Eighth Session
Panama City, Panama

COMMITTEE I
(Economic Development)

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTH MEETING

Held at Panama City on Thursday, 21 May, 1959,
at 9.55 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Consideration of draft resolutions (Conference Room Papers
Nos. 17/Rev.1, 10/Rev.1, 4, 11/Rev.1, 16/Rev.1, 9, 14, 23/Rev.1,
26, 27) (continued)

/PRESENT

PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. CASTILLO	(Nicaragua)
<u>Members :</u>	Mr. MUSICH	Argentina
	Mr. HAUS SOLIZ	Bolivia
	Mr. ALMEIDA SANTOS	Brazil
	Mr. VALENTE GURGEL	
	Mr. MARTY	Chile
	Mr. MENDEZ	
	Mr. DIAZ	Colombia
	Mr. MORERA BATRES	Costa Rica
	Mr. NONSERRAT	Cuba
	Mr. ICAZA	Ecuador
	Mr. SANCHEZ AGUILLON	El Salvador
	Mr. LETONDOT	France
	Mr. FUENTES MOHR	Guatemala
	Mr. PALACIOS	
	Mr. MENDOZA	Honduras
	Mr. URQUIDI	Mexico
	Mr. KAUFMANN	Netherlands
	Mr. GUERRERO	Nicaragua
	Mr. GARCES	
	Mr. RODRIGUEZ	Panama
	Mr. TURNER MORALES	
	Mr. CHAMORRO	Paraguay
	Mr. LEON CARRERA	Peru
	Mr. BARNES	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

/Mr. ROSENSON

Mr. ROSENSON	United States of America
Mr. POLIERI CARRIO	Uruguay
Mr. D'ASCOLI	Venezuela

ALSO PRESENT:Observers from
States not members
of the Commission

Mr. RICHARDSON	Canada
Mr. HOKES	Czechoslovakia
Mr. SOS	Hungary
Mr. BARBOSI	Italy
Mr. KANEDA	Japan
Mr. JELEN	Poland
Mr. BAZIKIN	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Observer from a State not
a Member of the United
Nations, attending in a
consultative capacity :

Mr. ENGELS	Federal Republic of Germany
------------	--------------------------------

Representatives of
specialized agencies:

Mr. VANDRIES	International Labour Organisation
Mr. EZEKIEL	Food and Agriculture Organization
Mr. PERRY	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
Mr. PENNA	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Representatives of inter-
governmental organization:

Mr. EPINAT

/Mr. POLLERI CARRIO

Secretariat:

Mr. EPINAT	Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration
Mrs. KYDAL	Organization of American States
Mr. PREBJECH	Executive Secretary
Mr. HEURTEMATTE	Commissioner for Technical Assistance
Mr. SWINSON	Deputy Director
Mr. MALINOWSKI	Director, Regional Commissions Section
Mr. SANTA CRUZ	Secretary of the Commission
Mr. AHUMADA	Secretary of the Committee

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

(Conference Room Papers Nos. 17/Rev.1, 10/Rev.1, 4, 11/Rev.1,
16/Rev.1, 9, 14, 23/Rev.1, 26, 27) (continued)

Conference Room Papers Nos. 17/Rev.1 and 10/Rev.1

Mr. ROSENSON (United States of America) said that as he had not been present when the voting had taken place at the previous meeting he would like it to be recorded that his delegation was in favour of the draft resolution in Conference Room Paper No. 17/Rev.1. With regard to the draft resolution in Conference Room Paper No. 10/Rev.1, which had also been approved at the previous meeting, his delegation would be able to cast an affirmative vote in the plenary session if the discussion on it could be re-opened now in order to permit two points to be taken into consideration. Firstly, he was uncertain what the term "common body" in the operative paragraph meant. Secondly, he suggested the deletion of the words "and operation" in that paragraph, inasmuch as his delegation held that it was not within the competence of the regional commissions to concern themselves with operational matters.

Mr. MENDEZ (Colombia) suggested that the words "common body" might be changed to "common secretariat".

Mr. BARNES (United Kingdom) suggested that for the sake of clarity and consistency the word "ECLA" in the last part of the operative paragraph should be replaced by "the ECLA Secretariat"

The draft resolution, as amended, as approved unanimously.

Conference Room Paper No. 4

/Mr. MUSICH

Mr. MUSICH (Argentina) suggested that the words "25,000 classrooms and 25,000 teachers" in the second preambular paragraph should be replaced by the words "a considerable number of classrooms and teachers". Moreover, the retention of the words "free and compulsory" in operative paragraph 2 would create difficulties for his Government, which was in the process of reviewing the whole system of primary education in Argentina.

Mr. MONSERRAT (Cuba) said that he could agree to the first of those amendments but could not accept the second; his delegation attached great importance to the concept of free and compulsory education.

Mr. URQUIDI (Mexico) associated himself with the remarks of the Cuban representative. The word "compulsory" did not imply an obligation to provide education in government schools as opposed to private schools, but was simply intended to convey the idea that Governments had an obligation to see that primary education was available to all children of school age.

Mr. MUSICH (Argentina) said that although the sponsors could not agree to the proposed deletion, his delegation, since it was wholeheartedly in sympathy with the fundamental purpose of the resolution, would vote in favour of the draft resolution with the reservation which he had expressed.

The draft resolution was approved unanimously.

Mr. PENNA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) expressed satisfaction that the Committee had given unanimous support to a resolution which was of major significance to UNESCO.

Conference Room Paper No. 11/Rev.1

Mr. PREBISCH (Executive Secretary) said that although the secretariat
/was aware

was aware of the desire of member countries to prevent any duplication of work as between ECLA and the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, he welcomed the present draft resolution because he had always held that the task was sufficiently great as to afford ample scope for more than one organization. In the present instance, what some might consider duplication of effort could more properly be described as co-ordination. The secretariat would therefore be glad to co-operate with the Council in the manner recommended in the draft resolution.

Mr. ALMEIDA SANTOS (Brazil) said that his delegation welcomed the Executive Secretary's statement.

Mr. MUSICH (Argentina) expressed appreciation of the co-operative spirit shown by the Executive Secretary, but said that from the discussions which had taken place between the delegations of his own country, Brazil and the United States in the Committee of the Twenty-One, he had gained the impression that the ECLA studies were in the nature of estimates of future economic development requirements, whereas the object of the Council's studies would be to evaluate the stage which economic development had reached.

Mr. PREBISCH (Executive Secretary) explained that in ECLA studies made in the past the purpose had been both to take stock of the present situation and to estimate future requirements. It was his understanding that the same would apply to the proposed Council studies.

Mr. MUSICH (Argentina) said that as he did not in any case think that the work to be entrusted to the Council would be a mere duplication of the work of ECLA and as his country would certainly wish to take advantage of it,

/he would

he would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. ROSENSON (United States of America) suggested that the words "as requested by it", should be inserted in sub-paragraph (b) of the operative part of the draft resolution after the words "the secretariat of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council", in order to make it consistent with the first preambular paragraph.

Mr. ALMEIDA SANTOS (Brazil) said that the United States suggestion was acceptable to his delegation.

The draft resolution was approved unanimously.

Conference Room Paper No.16/Rev.1

Mr. MUSICH (Argentina) and Mr. CARLES (Panama) expressed support of the draft resolution.

The draft resolution was approved unanimously.

Conference Room Paper No. 9

Mr. URQUIDI (Mexico) said that in order to make the draft resolution more general in its application he wished to suggest a number of amendments. In the third preambular paragraph the words "thereby effectively contributing to the development of the countries in the region" should be replaced by the words "and has thereby effectively contributed to the development of their respective countries". In the fifth preambular paragraph the words "and in other countries" might be added after the words "of the Caribbean" and the present wording "countries of those areas" might be replaced by the words "those areas and countries". Operative paragraph 2 might be amended to read: "To request the secretariat to study the possibility of expanding the programme

/with a

with a view to initiating intensive training courses in economic development in countries and areas in which they do not yet exist".

Mr. FUENTES MOHR (Guatemala) pointed out that through an oversight the name of Panama, which had been the original sponsor of the draft resolution, had been omitted. His delegation had no objection to the amendments suggested by Mexico.

Mr. TURNER MORALES (Panama) thanked the Guatemalan representative and also accepted the Mexican amendments.

Mr. ROSENSON (United States of America) said that he wished to suggest two amendments. Firstly, in the fifth preambular paragraph the words "is advisable" should be replaced by the words "would be advisable", in order not to appear to prejudge the effect of the resolution. Secondly, at the end of operative paragraph 2 he felt that the words "and to report thereon to the Committee of the Whole meeting in 1960" should be added. Finally, he thought that operative paragraph 1 could perhaps be deleted, inasmuch as the idea it embodied was set forth in the preamble and it was not the usual practice to include such expressions of thanks in resolutions.

Mr. GUERRERO (Nicaragua) and Mr. SANCHEZ AGUILLON (El Salvador) urged that operative paragraph 1 should be retained; it was only fair to stress the value of the work done by ECLA through its training programme.

Mr. ROSENSON (United States of America) withdrew his suggestion for the deletion of paragraph 1.

Mr. MENDOZA (Honduras) associated himself with the remarks of the representatives of Nicaragua and El Salvador, and said that the Mexican and the United States amendments would be acceptable to his delegation.

The draft resolution was approved unanimously.

/Conference Room

Conference Room Paper N° 14

Mr. AHUMADA (Secretary of the Committee) said that Argentina had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in Conference Room Paper N° 14, and that a small change had been made in the first operative paragraph: the words "other organizations" had been replaced by "the specialized agencies".

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the reference to the "formulation of standards for various statistics" in the second preambular paragraph should be deleted. Estándares was not an accepted Spanish word.

Mr. MUSICH (Argentina), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, accepted the Chairman's suggestion.

The draft resolution, as amended, was approved unanimously.

Conference Room Paper N° 23/Rev.1

Mr. MONSERRAT (Cuba) said that after hearing the views expressed at the preceding meeting, the sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed that the operative part could end immediately after the word "Governments".

Mr. LETONDOT (France) said that in view of that amendment, his delegation would be ready to support the draft resolution.

Mr. ROSENS N (United States of America) said that despite the amendment the draft resolution was still open to serious criticism. From the organizational point of view, the activities envisaged would constitute direct technical assistance and might therefore be regarded as outside ECLA's purview. Secondly, such activities would in practice tend to

/duplicate work

duplicate work done on the recommendation of the Committee of the Twenty-One. Thirdly, advisory groups of the type contemplated tended to place undue emphasis on comprehensive long-term projections based on somewhat questionable data. And lastly, in view of the financial implications of the proposal it would be preferable to rely on existing services.

Furthermore, the draft resolution proposed a new departure in ECIA's activities, and his Government had had no advance information that such a proposal would be made. Document E/CN.12/518 had only been circulated after the opening of the session.

Mr. MUSICH (Argentina) said that the amendment proposed by the sponsors had dispelled his fears regarding the scope of the proposal. As to the points made by the United States representative, he was convinced that the work of the advisory groups would not in fact duplicate any work done by other bodies, and that the studies carried out at the request of governments would no more than supplement those prepared by the Bureau of Technical Assistance Operations and by the Committee of the Twenty-One.

Mr. BARNES (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was in complete sympathy with the apparent object of the proposal, namely, to make the greatest possible use of existing facilities and opportunities for assisting the Latin American Governments in their economic development programmes. He would nevertheless be unable to support the proposal, on administrative and procedural grounds. In the first place, it seemed to be a proposal of general application which might be extended not only to the Latin American countries but also to other areas of the world, in particular those covered

/by the

by the Economic Commission for Africa and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Any action taken by ECIA would be regarded by Africa and Asia as a precedent. Such questions of general policy should be decided by the central body concerned: the Technical Assistance Committee of the Economic and Social Council.

Secondly, his delegation considered that the recent establishment of the Special Fund made it even more important than before that there should be the closest possible central co-ordination of all United Nations technical assistance activities.

Thirdly, the basic value of United Nations technical assistance programmes lay in their universality. Their chief advantage was the fact that they drew on the technical knowledge of the whole world. In the long run, it would be to the disadvantage of the programmes if they were split up into compartments, particularly if there were any tendency always to recruit experts for a particular area from the area concerned.

Mr. AIMEIDA SANTOS (Brazil) thought that the proposed advisory group would meet a long-felt need of the Latin American countries. Those responsible for the project would undoubtedly see to it that there was no needless duplication of other work.

Mr. URQUIDI (Mexico), supporting the draft resolution, stressed firstly that advisory services of the nature envisaged would not constitute a new departure, for advice to Governments had always been one of ECIA's principal functions. Secondly, he understood the purpose to be not the establishment of a new permanent office but the temporary detachment of some ECIA personnel

/to countries

to countries requesting advice, where their work would be co-ordinated with that of other bodies.

The draft resolution, as amended was approved by 19 votes to none with 2 abstentions.

Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands), explaining his vote, said that he had supported the draft resolution because the amendment introduced by the sponsors had made it clear that the decision on the type of work to be undertaken was not being anticipated and that the details would always be given thorough consideration at the proper time. Furthermore, he understood the text to imply that any such work would either be financed under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance or treated as an ordinary technical assistance project.

Conference Room Paper No. 26

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Panama) made a statement. ^{1/}

Mr. CHAMORRO (Paraguay) said that Paraguay as a land-locked country welcomed any initiative which would provide an outlet for its products to the world's markets.

Mr. DIASCOLI (Venezuela) thought that since some members of ECIA were not Latin American States, the text would be improved if in the operative paragraph the words "Latin American products" were replaced by "their products".

After a further discussion in which Mr. MOHR (Guatemala), Mr. URQUIDI (Mexico) and Mr. CHAMORRO (Paraguay) took part, Mr. POLLERI (Uruguay) proposed the insertion in the operative paragraph, after the words "in the free zone of olón", of the words "and in other free ports which are already established or may be established in the future".

1. The full text of this statement has been circulated as Information Document No. 50.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Panama) accepted the Venezuelan and Paraguayan suggestions.

The draft resolution, as amended, was approved unanimously.

Conference Room Paper No. 27

Mr. ROSENSON (United States of America) said that the objective of the sponsors of the draft resolution was to ensure that due emphasis was placed in the ECLA/TAO Economic Development Training Programme on the contribution to economic development made by private enterprise. If the Latin American countries were to develop their potential satisfactorily, much know-how and investment would have to be obtained from private sources. Trainees should therefore be adequately informed of the manner in which private enterprise operated, so that on returning to their homelands they would be able to give useful advice to the planners. The subjects listed in the first operative paragraphs were of course purely illustrative, and the programme was intended to be strictly complementary and not a substitute for any other course.

Mr. URQUIDI (Mexico) thought that it might be preferable to delete the enumeration in the first operative paragraph, leaving the curriculum to the discretion of the persons directing the course. The paragraph would then end with the word "policies".

He also felt that in the second operative paragraph the words "representative courses" should be replaced by "a similar course".

Mr. MARTY (Chile), Mr. ROSENSON (United States of America) and Mr. AIMEIDA SANTOS (Brasil) accepted the Mexican representatives' suggestion.

Mr. PALACIOS (Guatemala) said that his delegation had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution in the belief that the proposed course would lead to better

/understanding between

understanding between the public and private sectors and thus contribute to more balanced economies. He too would willingly accept the amendment suggested by Mexico.

Mr. DIASCOLI (Venezuela) said that he would readily support the draft resolution but hoped that the third preambular paragraph could be amended to read: "whereas, it would be desirable in this connection to promote among the general public a broader understanding of the complementary roles of private enterprise and public investment". The present wording could be taken to imply that government agencies concerned with the planning of economic development were unaware of the value of private enterprise.

Mr. ROSENSON (United States of America) accepted that suggestion.

The draft resolution, amended, was approved unanimously.

Statement by the representative of Colombia.

Mr. DIAZ (Colombia) made a statement.^{1/}

The meeting rose at 1:15 p.m.

^{1/} The full text of this statement had been circulated as Information Document No 51.