



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL E/CN.12/AC.32/SR.3 14 September 1955 ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA Sixth Session Bogota, Colombia

COMMITTEE VI (Co-ordination)

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRD MEETING

Held at Bogota on Wednesday 14 September 1955, at 4.15 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Programme of work and priorities for 1955-56

PRESENT:

Table with 3 columns: Role (Chairman, Rappporteur, Members), Name (Mr. LOPEZ ISA, Mr. GALEANO, Mr. SCHIOPETTO, Mr. PATRIOTA, Mr. ALVAREZ RESTREPO, Mr. DE CESPEDES, Mr. VILDOSOLA, Mr. PITARQUE, Mr. HARTWICK), and Country (Cuba, Paraguay, Argentine, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Chile, Ecuador, United States of America)

Note: Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the three working languages (Spanish, French or English) and addressed to Mr. Alfonso Santa Cruz, Secretary of the Conference, within 48 hours. The corrections should be accompanied by a note or written on headed notepaper and should give the symbol of the summary record in question, or, better, be made on a mimeographed copy of the record.

/Mr. BRUNET

Mr. BRUNET	France
Mr. APOLLON	Haiti
Mr. CACERES LARA	Honduras
Mr. ZAMORA	Mexico
Mr. GUERRERO	Nicaragua
Mr. AIZPU	Panama
Mr. SCOTT FOX	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mr. GINEBRA HENRIQUEZ	Dominican Republic
Mr. BERMUDEZ	Uruguay

Also present:

Representatives of a specialized agency:

Mr. VERA	International Monetary Fund
----------	--------------------------------

Representatives of inter-governmental organizations:

Mr. GLOWER	Inter-American Economic and Social Council
Mr. SANCHEZ	International Committee for European Migration

Secretariat:

Mr. SWENSON	Deputy Executive Secretary
Mr. MALINOWSKI	Department of Economic Affairs
Mr. URQUIDI	Director, Mexico City Office
Mr. SANTA CRUZ	Secretary of the Commission
Mr. VILASECA	Secretary of the Committee

PROGRAMME OF WORK AND PRIORITIES FOR 1955-56 (Conference Room Paper No.38).

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the question of programme of work and priorities for 1955-56.

Mr. SWENSON (Secretariat) explained that certain changes had been made in the work programme since the Rio meeting, mainly by way of relegation of items to a lower category; while new projects had been added, some with high priority, some in the category of "Other projects".

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that item 37 in Conference Room Paper No. 38 would require amendment to take account of the resolution adopted the previous day.

Mr. SCHIOPETTO (Argentina), referring to item 29 b), wondered whether it might not be advisable to delete the words "based on field investigation", which contained an idea not expressly stated in the relevant resolution, and might lead to misunderstanding.

Mr. ZAMORA (Mexico) pointed out that the summaries of resolutions given in Paper No. 38 could not be substituted for the resolutions themselves, and suggested that the document be regarded merely as an aide-mémoire, the task of the Committee being to consider the question of priorities, i.e. to establish a hierarchy among the items it comprised.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Secretary of the Commission) explained that the entire document, not merely the relative degree of priority of the various items, was before the Committee. The explanatory matter did not merely summarize the resolutions, but gave indications as to the proposed methods of implementing them. Moreover, the form in which the document was drawn up was strictly in accordance with ECOSOC's instructions, and had always been followed by the Commission. Naturally, in the event of any discrepancy between the text of the summaries and the resolutions, the latter would prevail.

Mr. ZAMORA (Mexico) thought it would be difficult to discuss more than the mere order of priority without a careful comparison of the summaries with the text of the resolutions, since there might be other discrepancies of the type disclosed by the Argentine representative. He suggested that the resolution be referred to by number, and not summarized.

/Mr. DE CESPEDES

Mr. DE CESPEDES (Cuba) pointed out that many of the resolutions referred to had still to be approved in plenary. The Committee would therefore be on surer ground if it merely considered the question of priority of the various items.

Mr. SCHIOPETTO (Argentina) felt that the essential task of the Committee was to decide whether or not it could approve the order of priorities established by the Secretariat. It could be left to the Secretariat to modify the explanatory matter in the light of the discussions and the decisions taken in plenary.

Mr. URQUIDI (Secretariat) stated that, in accordance with the method followed by all United Nations Commissions and by ECLA from the outset, it was necessary that the Commission should either approve or modify the work programme submitted by the Secretariat for 1955-56, which took account of all resolutions and indicated what could or could not be done in that period. The substance of the document would form part of the Commission's report to the Economic and Social Council, and he therefore felt the Committee should give its views on that substance, and not merely on the priorities.

Mr. BERMUDEZ (Uruguay) suggested that a note be added at the beginning of Paper No. 38 stating that the document referred to the order of priority of the projects and the manner of carrying them out in 1955-56; and that the purpose of the extracts from the projects was merely one of identification. In regard to their scope the texts of the resolutions would prevail.

After further discussion, in which the representatives of the Dominican Republic and Paraguay took part along with the delegations already mentioned, the Uruguayan proposal was adopted unanimously, it being understood that the Secretariat would revise the document in the light of the final plenary meetings, and fill in the existing gaps.

Mr. SCOTT-FOX (United Kingdom) drew attention to the fact that the previous session of the Committee of the Whole had been assured that a statement on item 39, Studies of the Terms of Trade and their Influence on the Rate of Economic Development, would be ready for the Commission's sixth session, while item 40, Study of Multilateral Compensation Settlements among Latin American and European Countries, would be completed in 1956.

All, except eight of the working documents for the session, had reached his Government more than 30 days before it was due to begin. In the case of those eight, however, his and other delegations had not had an opportunity of studying them sufficiently or of receiving instructions from their Governments.

If he mentioned such delay in the preparation of documents, it was not because he did not appreciate the difficulties of the Secretariat. His main concern was whether the Commission was not expecting the Secretariat to undertake more than it could handle. It was unfair to place an excessive burden on the Secretariat and then complain that the documentation had not been received.

He realized, of course, that the priority system left the Secretariat a certain freedom of manoeuvre. However, the accumulation of deferred projects might, in the long run, limit the Secretariat's ability to take on more important work.

He wished to re-emphasize his Government's keen interest in the forthcoming Expert Conference on the Iron and Steel and Transformation Industries and the Expert Conference on Economic Development and the Technique of Programming.

Mr. ALVAREZ NESTREPO (Colombia) said that the scheme adopted by the Secretariat was in full accordance with the needs of the peoples of Latin America. Economic development and the technique of programming, the expansion of agricultural production, productivity and production costs, the iron and steel making and transforming industries, the development of electric power and foreign trade were all items of extreme importance to the whole of Latin America, the first one, in particular, being of truly vital significance.

He realized that the Secretariat's resources were insufficient to permit it to deal with hundreds of problems existing in the continent. However, the items given high priority had direct bearing on the most crucial problems, at least as far as Colombia was concerned.

Mr. DE CESPEDES (Cuba) proposed that the Committee go through the programme item by item, on the assumption that items passed without comment were tacitly adopted.

/ Mr. SCHIOPETTO

Mr. SCHIOPETTO (Argentina) proposed that, to save time, each delegation be invited to make such comment on the programme as it saw fit.

After some discussion, Mr. DE CESPEDES withdrew his proposal.

The procedure proposed by the Argentinian representative was adopted.

Mr. DE CESPEDES (Cuba) pointed out that, according to the Corrigendum to Conference Room Paper No. 38, both project 16 and project 18 were due to be completed in 1957. The description of project 18 in the programme of work and priorities 1955-56, however, said that project 18 was closely related to the coffee study (project 16) and would not be started until that study was completed. If that was so, why was project 18 included in the programme at all?

Mr. SWENSON (Deputy Director) explained that before undertaking the broader study described under item 18, the Secretariat wished to acquire experience in the study of productivity from the coffee study, already begun in El Salvador and to be completed in 1957.

Mr. BERMUDEZ (Uruguay) inquired whether the study on productivity of coffee production could be applied to other agricultural activities under study.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ, Secretary of the Commission, replied that the Secretariat was not in a position to do so at the moment.

Replying to a suggestion by Mr. ZAMORA (Mexico) that, to avoid the apparent contradiction, the coffee study be described as the first stage in the general study of agricultural productivity, he pointed out that the two studies were authorized by resolutions passed at different sessions.

Mr. SWENSON (Deputy Director) replying to Mr. SCHIOPETTO (Argentina), said that he thought that some aspects of the study of project 18 might be begun rather earlier than indicated if resources permitted.

After further discussion, in the course of which the representatives of Colombia, Mexico, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Cuba and Haiti intervened, it was agreed to take note of the statement by the Secretariat and leave it to the latter to modify the description of project 18 accordingly.

Mr. PITARQUE, (Ecuador), noted that item 34, Studies of Possibilities of Establishing Processing Industries Utilizing Domestically Produced Raw

/ Materials;

Materials; item 35, Food Processing Industries; and item 24, Study of Economic and Technological Problems of the Banana Industry, were all classed as "Other projects" -hence of relatively low priority.

In the case of project 34, the description rather suggested that undue prominence would be given to processing industries, such as iron and steel, chemical and pulp and paper industries, in the more developed Latin American countries at the expense of agricultural processing industries in countries such as his own.

Mr. URQUIDI (Secretariat), regretted that lack of resources made it impossible fully to meet the demands of the projects. The Secretariat had accordingly suggested giving them a low priority.

In the case of the study on the banana industry, it had been agreed that since the IA-ECOSOC, which now had a standing Banana Commission, was undertaking the study, the ECLA Secretariat would only examine aspects incidental to its general or its country studies.

Replying to a question by Mr. PITARQUE (Ecuador), he said that priorities were fixed by the Commission. If, however, all subjects were given high priority, the Secretariat would be obliged to follow some sort of priority within that high priority, unless additional resources were forthcoming.

Mr. ZAMORA (Mexico) after asking the representatives of Ecuador and Cuba what priority they proposed for the projects, suggested that the Secretariat, when aware that proposals went beyond the limit of its resources, should place the fact on record as early as possible.

Mr. PITARQUE (Ecuador), said that studies on such processing industries as the banana, coffee, cocoa and rubber, in which his country was intensely interested, were too often based on costs and economic minima in countries where conditions were totally different. He would like to see a rather more balanced distribution in projects between industries in the smaller countries and those in the more industrialized countries of Latin America. Perhaps a study could be made of a group of countries with a similar economic structure.

Mr. URQUIDI (Secretariat) said that the Secretariat was very mindful of the wishes expressed by certain delegations that the industries of interest to the smaller countries should be studied, and assured the

/Committee that

Committee that an effort would be made to consider the low priority project mentioned by the representative of Ecuador (project 34) if resources permitted.

It was agreed to take note of the statement by the Secretariat.

In the absence of further comment, the CHAIRMAN declared the Programme of Work and Priorities, 1955-56 (Conference Room Paper No. 36 and Corrigendum) adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.