



UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL  
E/CN.12/AC.23/SR.1  
14 April 1953  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

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

COMMITTEE VI (Co-ordination)

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTH MEETING

Held at Rio de Janeiro on Tuesday, 14 April 1953 at 5.30 p.m.

CONTENTS:

- Secretary's Statement on the items on the agenda
- General debate (E/CN.12/311)

/PRESENT:

PRESENT:

CHAIRMAN:	Mr. NORIEGA MORALES	Guatemala
RAPPORTEUR:	Mr. DE TINGUY DU POUET	France
MEMBERS:	Mr. PORTELA	Argentina
	Mr. PAIVA LEITE	Brazil
	Mr. MEJIA PALACTO	Colombia
	Mr. SILVERIO	Cuba
	Mr. SEPULVEDA CONTRERAS	Chile
	Mr. MASPONS	Ecuador
	Mr. MARTINEZ	El Salvador
	Mr. BOHAN )	United States
	Mr. KELLOGG )	
	Mr. HUDECOURT	Haiti
	Mr. LIADOR	Mexico
	Mr. BARRETO	Peru
	Mr. JACKSON	United Kingdom
	Mr. ITURBIDE	Uruguay

Also present:

Representatives of an inter-governmental organization:

Mr. HEURTELATTE )	Inter-American Economic and Social Council (IA-ECOSOC)
Mr. TAYLOR )	

Secretariat:

Mr. PREBISCH	Executive Secretary
Mr. ALFONSO SANTA CRUZ	Secretary of the Committee

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN hoped that the Committee's work would lead to satisfactory results, in keeping with the constructive spirit and the climate of genuine co-operation which had at all times characterized the Commission's work.

SECRETARY'S STATEMENT ON THE ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Secretary of the Committee) said that the documents concerning co-ordination between the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Inter-American Economic and Social Council had already been distributed to delegates. He recapitulated in detail the steps which had been taken in that matter, both by the Commission and by IA-ECOSOC, since the fourth session in Mexico. He emphasized the difference between co-ordination at Government level and co-ordination at Secretariat level; it was clear from the various resolutions approved by both bodies that co-ordination had been achieved at Secretariat level to the satisfaction of the Governments concerned. He then referred to co-ordination at Government level and to the invitation extended to IA-ECOSOC, at the fourth session, to appoint a representative for the purpose of studying jointly with the ECLA representative whatever measures they might consider adequate and necessary for effecting co-ordination at Government level in practical and positive form. He described the action taken by the Executive Secretary, who had been appointed the ECLA representative at that fourth session, and by Mr. Lleras Camargo, Director General of the Organization of American States, who had been appointed the latter's representative in November 1952.

/Following an

Following an exchange of letters in which both sides had put forward suggestions, Mr. Lleras Camargo had expressed the view, in a letter of 27 March 1953, that the joint proposals had been "left somewhat in suspense", as a result of the resolution adopted by IA-ECOSOC at its most recent meeting at Caracas. At that meeting the Executive Committee of IA-ECOSOC had been asked to prepare a report on the Council's status, to adopt measures to correct its defects, and to report to the Tenth Inter-American Conference.

GENERAL DEBATE (Document E/CN.12/311)

Mr. PREBISCH (Executive Secretary) stated that the problem had been reduced to very simple terms. No problem of co-ordination at Secretariat level existed, if indeed it ever had existed. At Government level there was but one problem -- that of the overlapping of meetings. He was anxious to know the views of Governments on the question.

The CHAIRMAN gave a summary of the statements made by the Secretary of the Committee and by the Executive Secretary, and invited discussion.

Mr. SILVERIO (Cuba) wished to explain that the IA-ECOSOC resolution to which the Secretary had referred had been lent a significance which it did not possess. He explained its scope, with which he was very familiar since he had actually drafted the text at the request of five Governments.

Mr. MEJÍA (Colombia) understood from the Chairman's summary that no problem existed. If agreement had been

/reached at

reached at Secretariat level and if conversations had been begun between ECLA and IA-ECOSOC for the purpose of finding a solution at Government level, nothing could be done until Mr. Prebisch and Mr. Lleras Camargo had reached their considered conclusions. He would not venture a suggestion on the best means of achieving co-ordination at Government level. The Committee might dissolve that very day and leave the solution of the problem to the Secretaries of the two bodies. He proposed that they should be given a vote of confidence and that the solution to be worked by both of them should be awaited.

Mr. HUDICOURT (Haiti) supported the Colombian delegation.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Secretary of the Committee) in reply to the delegate of Cuba, explained that the opinion that negotiations had been left "somewhat in suspense" had not been expressed by the ECLA Secretariat, but in the letter of the Secretary-General of OAS.

Mr. SILVERIO (Cuba) echoed the explanation given by the Secretary of the Committee. Both bodies were necessary, for all the countries concerned liked ECLA and liked IA-ECOSOC. What they did not like was a duplication of functions. He believed that Mr. Prebisch and Mr. Lleras Camargo should be left free to continue their negotiations, since they had been appointed for the purpose of reaching agreement on the question.

Mr. PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) thanked the Secretary for  
/his statement

his statement on the problem of co-ordination and praised the excellent work done by the Co-ordination Committee the establishment of which had been proposed at the fourth session of ECLA in Mexico. As yet, there had been no overlapping in the studies undertaken by either body. On that point he quoted the statement made to the Commission by the Executive Secretary of ECLA, which reflected vigorous and constructive activity. The recent publication of the study of Sugar Taxation in Caribbean and Central-American Countries, prepared jointly by the two bodies, was evidence of the success of co-ordination at the Secretariat level. At Government level the establishment of contact had been slow. ECLA had appointed Mr. Prebisch in June 1951, but not until December 1952 had IA-ECOSOC's appointment of Mr. Lleras Camargo been communicated to ECLA. He hoped that the change from contact by letter to personal conversations would hasten the solution of the problem and reaffirmed his confidence that Mr. Prebisch would bring negotiations to a satisfactory conclusion. On behalf of the Brazilian delegation, he expressed satisfaction at the establishment of ECLA as a permanent body. That fact changed the situation, for previously co-ordination had been undertaken by a provisional organization which had since become a consultative body for governments, the need for which was not in dispute. The Brazilian delegation was consulting with other delegation with a view to working out a draft resolution which he hoped would meet with the Committee's approval and which would be circulated shortly.

/In substance,

In substance, it stressed the need, both at Secretariat and Government level, for drawing up a calendar of international economic conferences; by means of such a calendar the present problems at Government level would be solved.

Mr. HUDICOURT (Haiti) explained certain points to the delegate of Brazil.

Mr. HEURTELATTE (IA-ECOSOC) stated that the representatives of IA-ECOSOC had come to the fifth session to discuss the item of co-ordination, and that they had been instructed by his organization to keep to the texts approved by ECLA in Mexico and by IA-ECOSOC in Panama. He congratulated the Secretariat on what had already been achieved, and thought the Committee should await the report of Mr. Prebisch and Mr. Lleras Camargo on the outcome of their conversations. He corrected the Secretary on the question of the final suspension of negotiations, and read another paragraph from Mr. Lleras Camargo's letter in which willingness was expressed to continue them. He explained to the Brazilian representative that the necessary tardiness of procedure explained the delay in the appointment of a representative of IA-ECOSOC.

Mr. PREBISCH (Executive Secretary) expressed complete agreement with the interpretation given by the representative of IA-ECOSOC concerning the state of the negotiations, and said he was planning to visit the United States for personal conversations with Mr. Lleras Camargo.

Mr. PORTELA (Argentina) commenting on existing problems, said that the problem to which no solution seemed

/yet to have

yet to have been found was that of the frequency of international conferences. He thought that the Brazilian delegation's proposal regarding a calendar would be valuable.

Mr. SEPÚLVEDA (Chile) agreed with the representatives of Brazil and Argentina; he would await the Brazilian draft before expressing an opinion.

Mr. HEURTEMATTE (IA-ECOSOC) said it would be a mistake to lay down rules for the representatives of the two organizations concerned; they should be quite free in their negotiations to take whatever decisions they thought fit. Steps could be taken later for giving effect to the results of their agreement.

Mr. PREBISCH (Executive Secretary) thanked the representative of IA-ECOSOC for expressing the wish that no fixed rules should be laid down for him and that he should be left free in the negotiations. However, it would be very useful to him to have some indication of delegates' views. Various formulae had already been discussed and although he was now inclined towards one of them, he was anxious first to ascertain the views of the delegations rather than risk arriving at a solution which might subsequently not be acceptable to them.

Mr. PORTELA (Argentina) elaborated on the calendar, and said there was no other means for facilitating co-ordination.

Mr. SILVERIO (Cuba) said that a draft resolution not yet submitted to the Committee should not be discussed,

/and repeated



and repeated that the whole question should be left to the Secretaries of the two organizations.

Mr. BOHAN (United States of America) agreed with the delegate of Cuba that the Committee should wait for the Brazilian proposal. He pointed out the dangers likely to arise in 1954 and the burden which the sending of representatives to three economic conferences (ECLA, IA-ECOSOC and the Tenth Inter-American Conference) would lay upon many Governments. His Government was proud of ECLA and wished it to continue its work, and, as a member of the machinery of the Pan-American Union, it supported IA-ECOSOC. He hoped that the necessary co-ordination would be achieved.

Mr. BARRETO (Peru) expressed confidence in the results of the negotiations between Mr. Prebisch and Mr. Lleras Camargo. He was interested to know what formula was in Mr. Prebisch's mind.

Mr. PREBISCH (Executive Secretary) said he would first like to acquaint himself with the Brazilian draft resolution because whenever he thought he had a good idea he waited to learn the good ideas of others. He asked the delegate of Peru to be patient.

Mr. PAIVA LEITE (Brazil) stated that his delegation's draft resolution would be circulated the next day and suggested that the Committee's second meeting should be held on Thursday.

It was agreed.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.