

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.12/SR.32
20 June 1950
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH*

This Document Received
by Airmail Pouch
Date JAN 2 - 1951

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA

Third Session

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTY-SECOND MEETING

Held in Montevideo, Uruguay
on Tuesday, 20 June 1950, at 10:30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Organization of the work of the Commission
Report of Committee I (E/CN.12/186, E/CN.12/191, E/CN.12/192,
E/CN.12/193, E/CN.12/194)
Report of Committee 4 (E/CN.12/189, E/CN.12/203, E/CN.12/205)
Statement by Mr. Mendes-France concerning the report of the
Commission
Proposal of the representative of Guatemala regarding the place
of the fourth session of the Commission

Chairman: Mr. IRIGOYEN Argentina

Reporteur: Mr. MENDES-FRANCE France

NOTE: Any corrections of this record should be submitted in writing in any of the working languages (English, French or Spanish) and within three working days, to the Executive Secretary, Parque Hotel, Montevideo, Uruguay. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeograph copy of the record.

* This document has been reproduced in New York from the original issued at Montevideo.

/Members:
E/CN.12/SR.32

<u>Members:</u>	Mr. SCARPAITI	Argentina
	Mr. ALVARADO	Bolivia
	Mr. de VILLAS BOAS	Brazil
	Mr. BALTEA	Chile
	Mr. MACHADO	Cuba
	Mr. SANZ LAVARA	Dominican Republic
	Mr. PALLARES	Ecuador
	Mr. AVILES	El Salvador
	Mr. RAMIREZ	Guatemala
	Mr. CRUZ	Honduras
	Mr. ZAMORA	Mexico
	Mr. LICHTVELD	Netherlands
	Mr. ARGUELLO GIL	Nicaragua
	Mr. A. GONZALEZ	Panama
	Mr. HERRERO	Paraguay
	Mr. WILLIAMS	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. RAVNDAL	United States of America
	Mr. Ariosto GONZALEZ	Uruguay

Representatives of specialized agencies:

Mr. COLLETT	International Labour Organisation (ILO)
Mr. ETCHEATS	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Mr. WENDLING	International Refugee Organization (IRO)

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

<u>Category A:</u>	Mrs. APARICIO	World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA)
<u>On Register:</u>	Mr. FAROPPA	Inter-American Commission for Trade and Production
	Mr. MASON	International Federation of Transport Workers
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. MARTINEZ CABANAS	Executive Secretary
	Mr. CASTILLO	Deputy Executive Secretary
	Mr. SWENSON	Secretary of the Commission
	Mr. FURTADO	Economist

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION

At the request of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ CABANAS (Executive Secretary) gave an outline of outstanding business. He also informed the members that the Chairman of the Commission was proposing that a committee composed of the Chairmen and the Rapporteur of the Commission and the chairmen of the four

/committees

committees which had been established during the session should be set up to decide the order of priority of the work which the Secretariat had been instructed to do in the interval between the third and fourth sessions.

Mr. MACHADO (Cuba) supported that proposal.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE 1 (E/CN.12/186, E/CN.12/191, E/CN.12/192, E/CN.12/193, E/CN.12/194)

Mr. ZAMORA (Mexico), the Rapporteur of Committee 1, presented his report.

The report of Committee 1 was adopted.

Mr. ZAMORA (Mexico), the Rapporteur of Committee 1, presented the draft resolution on Immigration adopted by that Committee (E/CN.12/191).

That draft resolution was adopted.

Mr. ZAMORA (Mexico), the Rapporteur of Committee 1, presented the draft resolution on technical assistance adopted by that Committee (E/CN.12/192).

That draft resolution was adopted.

Mr. ZAMORA (Mexico), the Rapporteur of Committee 1, presented the draft resolution on studies on distribution, markets and prices of agricultural products adopted by that Committee (E/CN.12/193).

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) requested that some errors in translation he had noted in the French text should be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would make the requisite corrections.

The draft resolution was adopted.

Mr. ZAMORA (Mexico), the Rapporteur of Committee 1, presented the draft resolution on economic development and anti-cyclical policy adopted by that Committee (E/CN.12/194).

Mr. RAVNDAL (United States of America) reminded the Commission that the United States delegation had reserved its position on the resolution on economic development and anti-cyclical policy when it had been submitted to Committee 1. It had subsequently examined that draft thoroughly and had found that sections II, III, IV, V, VI, VII and X had profound implications in relation to international commitments undertaken by its Government, as well as by other Governments Members of ECLA, and that their adoption would involve serious commitments as to policies to be followed in the future to achieve economic development.

/On the other

On the other hand, the United States delegation could subscribe to sections I and VIII. It could also accept section IX provided that the last paragraph were altered to read: "Recommends that the Secretariat of the Commission should study measures for full employment suited to the economic characteristics of the Latin American countries, keeping in mind the relationship with balance of payments problems".

It must be observed in that connexion that the report of the United Nations experts on full employment included recommendations to the countries of the centre; but those countries, although directly concerned, had not yet completed the study of the measures proposed, which would be debated only at the forthcoming session of the Economic and Social Council. That being so, it would be premature to ask the ECLA Secretariat to study the applicability of those measures to the Latin American countries. The United States Government considered the economic development of Latin America to be the foremost problem of that continent. He did not think that it was necessary for him to offer concrete evidence of the United States' concern. Owing to the seriousness of the problem, however, all due consideration should be given to the methods by which it could be solved. The United States feared that the adoption of hastily-conceived means might be self-defeating.

Before it made its decision, the United States Government would have to study thoroughly the important draft resolution under consideration and the penetrating economic analysis provided by the ECLA Secretariat, upon which it had been based. The United States delegation would therefore abstain from expressing its opinion regarding sections II, III, IV, V, VI, VII and X of the draft and would confine itself to recommending to its Government that it should submit them to a thorough examination from the economic and social points of view as soon as possible.

It must be reiterated that the United States Government had a profound interest in the continuous development of the economies of Latin America, the achievement of which would be to the advantage not only of the Latin American countries but of all peoples throughout the world.

(The full text of Mr. Ravndal's statement will be found in document E/CN.12/215.)

/Mr. do VILLAS BOAS

Mr. de VILLAS BOAS (Brazil) had listened to the statement of the United States representative with great attention. He must, however, lay stress upon the fact that the draft resolution on economic development and anti-cyclical policy had been the work of a number of delegations and had been approved by a majority in Committee I. The final text of that draft was a synthesis of the different views expressed and represented the most far-reaching concessions that both sides had been able to make in the interests of unanimous acceptance. The Brazilian delegation would therefore vote for the text adopted by Committee I.

Mr. BALTRA (Chile) emphasized that his country, among others, had received concrete evidence of the United States' concern for the economic development of Latin America; he had been pleased to hear that concern reaffirmed in the United States representative's statement. He could not, however, concur in that representative's view that the draft resolution under consideration had been hastily conceived. The draft resolution was to be commended for setting out frankly and realistically the view shared by all the countries of Latin America with regard to the problems of economic development. The Chilean delegation was fully aware of the scope of the proposed resolution and recognized that the adoption of several of its sections would lead to fundamental changes in existing economic policies on the international level. Such changes, however, were essential for really effective international co-operation in the economic field.

Mr. RAMIREZ (Guatemala) concurred in the views of the Brazilian and Chilean representatives.

Section IX of the draft resolution had already been debated at length in Committee I; to consider the amendment proposed by the United States representative at that stage would involve reopening the entire debate. He therefore suggested that the United States representative should withdraw that amendment and add Section IX to the other sections on which the United States delegation had decided to abstain from expressing its opinion.

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

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) was loath to let slip the possibility of achieving a compromise between views which were not actually as irreconcilable as it might seem. The amendment to section IX suggested by the United States delegation could be discussed informally; agreement might perhaps be reached if the meeting were suspended. It would be worth while to make the attempt.

/Mr. ALVARADO

Mr. ALVARADO (Bolivia) supported the French representative's suggestion.

Mr. RAMIREZ (Guatemala) recalled the fact that the representative of the United States had agreed at his own suggestion, to withdraw his proposed amendment to section IX and had given notice of his intention to abstain from voting on it. It would not, therefore, serve any purpose to interrupt the Commission's work.

The Guatemalan delegation wholeheartedly supported the draft resolution submitted by Committee 1. Any fresh exchange of views on that point would be useless because the United States representative's objections affected the substance of the draft resolution; there could, therefore, be no hope of drafting a text likely to meet with unanimous approval.

Mr. RAVNDAL (United States of America) pointed out that he had not formally proposed any amendment; he had confined himself to stating that the United States delegation would be in a position to subscribe to section IX if it were altered in a certain way. It had been far from his intention to provoke a debate on that section of the draft resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS (United Kingdom) made a formal proposal that the discussion on the report of Committee 1 should be postponed until the following meeting.

It was so decided.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE 4 (E/CN.12/189, E/CN.12/203, E/CN.12/204, E/CN.12/205)

Mr. AVILES (El Salvador), the Rapporteur of Committee 4, presented the report of that Committee (E/CN.12/189).

Mr. ALVARADO (Bolivia) said that his delegation found the report satisfactory; but reminded the Commission that the Bolivian Government was anxious that certain social problems should be studied, as their solution would go some way towards alleviating the living conditions of the rural population in his country.

The report of Committee 4 was adopted

Mr. AVILES (El Salvador), the Rapporteur of Committee 4, presented the draft resolution on co-operation with the Inter-American Economic and Social Council adopted by that Committee (E/CN.12/203).

That draft resolution was adopted.

Mr. AVILES (El Salvador), the Rapporteur of Committee 4, presented the draft resolution on co-operation with UNESCO (E/CN.12/204).

/Mr. MACHADO

Mr. MACHADO (Cuba) proposed that the words "in the region" should be substituted for the words "in Latin America" in sub-paragraph (a) of the fourth paragraph of the operative part, in order to make it consonant with the spirit in which the draft resolution had been examined and adopted by the working group of Committee 4 and by that Committee itself.

It was so decided.

The draft resolution on co-operation with UNESCO, thus amended, was adopted.

Mr. AVILES (El Salvador), the Rapporteur of Committee 4, presented the draft resolution on the rules of procedure adopted by that Committee (E/CN.12/205).

Mr. RAVNDAL (United States of America) reminded the Commission that the views of his Government on the question with which that draft resolution dealt had been reproduced in the report of the Rapporteur of Committee 4.

The draft resolution on the rules of procedure was adopted.

STATEMENT BY MR. MENDES-FRANCE CONCERNING THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France), Rapporteur, said that the draft report of the Commission (E/CN.12/190), lengthy though it was, was actually made up principally of the reports of the four Committees already adopted by the Commission. The first part was a recapitulation of the activities of the Secretariat during the interval between the second and the third sessions.

The Secretariat had been mainly responsible for the heavy work of compilation. He must take the opportunity to thank it for the zeal, hard work and objectivity which it had shown in so doing.

The Rapporteur's work had so far been light. His main function would be to present, to explain and, if need be, to justify the Commission's report in the Economic and Social Council. He pledged himself to do so to the best of his ability; he did not, indeed, expect that he would encounter any great difficulties, in view of the hard work done by the Commission during its third session and the fact that the decisions it had taken were constructive ones.

PROPOSAL BY THE GUATEMALAN REPRESENTATIVE REGARDING THE PLACE OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE COMMISSION

Mr. RAMIREZ (Guatemala) proposed that the fourth session of the Commission should be held at Mexico City. A decision to that effect would be in conformity with the principle that sessions should be distributed among the areas of Latin America. Mexico City, furthermore, had all the prerequisites for the

/reception

reception of the Commission. The Mexican delegation, which he had consulted informally, was in favour of the proposal.

Mr. ZAMORA (Mexico) thanked the Guatemalan representative for his proposal. He must, however, defer his delegation's formal reply until the following meeting.

Mr. SANZ LAVARA (Dominican Republic) was glad to support the Guatemalan representative's proposal.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Commission would consider that proposal at its following meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.
