

United Nations

**ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL**

Nations Unies

**CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL**

UNRESTRICTED
E/P.V. 110
11 August 1947
English

MASTER FILE

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Fifth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND TENTH MEETING

Lake Success, New York
Monday, 11 August 1947, at 11.00 a.m.

Acting President: Mr. Jan. PAPANEK (Czechoslovakia)

NOTE: This verbatim record is issued under rule 35 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council.

The rules of procedure do not provide for the submission of corrections to the verbatim record, but only to the summary record (rule 49).

Interpretations as delivered at meetings are recorded in the present verbatim record for the convenience of representatives, and corrections to these interpretations need not be submitted.

Corrections to the text of original speeches should be sent to the Secretary of the Economic and Social Council for the guidance of the writers of the summary records.

The PRESIDENT: I declare the one hundred and tenth meeting of the Economic and Social Council open.

Before beginning work on the items of our agenda, I should like to read to the Council two telegrams which I have received, one from the President of the Council and one from the Vice-President of the Council.

The telegram from the President reads: "Most grateful your cable stop inexpressibly disappointed at my inability attend any part of this session stop feel have let down my colleagues stop hope they will understand my situation here and so excuse stop wish session and you all success. Ramaswami Mudaliar."

The other telegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Enrique Garcia Sayan, reads as follows: "President, Economic and Social Council, Have the honour to inform you that representative previously designated, Dr. Alberto Arca Parro, being unable to attend present session, the Government has agreed to appoint as representative of Peru to the Council Deputy Mr. Juvenal Monge, and to maintain as alternate representative Ambassador Dr. Carlos Holquin Delavalle. I have the honour to be etc. "

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA

The PRESIDENT: The main documents with reference to the Commission for Latin America are the draft proposal, document E/531, and document E/531/Add. 1. There is also a draft resolution proposed by the representative of New Zealand, document E/537.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): In document E/531 you will find the Report of the Drafting Committee on the Economic Commission for Latin America, which I have the honour to submit to you in my capacity as Chairman of that Committee.

As it is indicated in the document to which I have just referred, the Drafting Committee met on 6 August 1947, and after a very constructive meeting agreed on the text which is submitted to you.

This draft is a composite one which gives recognition to the suggestions made on this subject by the delegations of Chile, China and Cuba and to some of the points which were stressed during the general debate which took place in the Council. There are two points to which I should like to direct your attention. The first one is that, in considering the composition of the proposed ad hoc committee, the Drafting Committee was of the opinion that the membership of the committee dealing with the problems of a specific region should not be limited to representatives from that region. The Drafting Committee recognized that the Council might give due weight to that consideration and might wish to appoint additional members to the ad hoc committee, but considered that the number of members on such a committee should not exceed nine.

In the draft resolution which is submitted to the Council, you will find the names of seven countries which were the original ones suggested in the resolution submitted by the Cuban delegation.

The second point to which I should like to direct your attention is that during the meeting of the Drafting Committee the New Zealand representative submitted a draft resolution which included a proposal for the Economic and Employment Commission and its Sub-Commissions on Employment and Economic Stability and on Development to examine and report to the Council upon general questions involved in the creation of regional economic commissions. In the Drafting Committee there was some doubt as to whether this matter was within its terms of reference. In view of this doubt, the New Zealand delegation reserved its position on the above resolution.

There is a final point which I should also like to call to your attention. In the original suggestion made by the Cuban delegation it was recommended that the ad hoc committee should report to the Council at the session of the Council following the Bogota Conference. In the text which appears today in document E/531 there is no mention as to the time when the ad hoc committee must report to the Council. I think, however, there is no doubt that in the minds of the countries represented in the Drafting Committee the idea was for the ad hoc committee to report to the Council as soon as the matter had been considered by the Bogota Conference.

Since the Bogota Conference is going to take place in January, we must suppose that the report from the ad hoc committee will be presented at the next session of the Council. This is the report which I have the honour to submit to you.

Mr. PERRY (New Zealand): The Report of the Drafting Committee indicates that the New Zealand representative on that Committee reserved his position, and the representative of Cuba has explained fairly and clearly the reasons for that reservation.

I should like to stress again that the New Zealand Government and the New Zealand delegation place considerable importance on the necessity for the development of undeveloped and under-developed regions, and on the assumption that the resolution incorporated in the Committee's Report meets with the general support of this Council the New Zealand delegation will certainly not oppose that resolution.

We anticipate that, when this whole question comes to be considered before the Council again, the studies suggested in that Report and the

conclusions reached by the Committee itself and by the Bogota Conference may be of considerable assistance to the Council in enabling it better to formulate its decisions on the establishment of an Economic Commission for Latin America.

There is just one particular phrase in that resolution to which I should like to refer mainly for the point of clarification. That is in paragraph 1 which follows the words "Decides upon the following terms of reference for the Committee:

"1. The Committee shall consider the factors bearing upon the establishment of an Economic Commission for Latin America...."

As the New Zealand delegation reads that sentence, and as I think it was understood within the Drafting Committee, it does not mean that the Drafting Committee as such will present a complete and elaborate report dealing with the whole question of regional organization. The Drafting Committee will presumably be concerned primarily with those factors which specifically relate to Latin-American conditions.

The reservation made by the New Zealand representative during the meetings of the Committee arose out of and followed the lines of the remarks of the New Zealand representative in this Council, remarks which referred, as other speakers have referred, to the advisability of examining the whole question of the regional, as opposed to functional, organization.

The New Zealand delegation has proposed a resolution, which I suggest should be considered at the same time as the Committee's report, requesting the Economic and Employment Commission and its Sub-Commissions to examine and report to the Council upon the general questions involved in the creation of regional economic commissions as a means for the promotion of the aims and objectives of the United Nations.

The wording is expressly and purposely left fairly general because the exact implications involved in this cannot be seen except by experts who are devoting their time to the problem.

It is also uncertain as to when the Economic and Employment Commission and its Sub-Commissions will be able to report to this Council. It may be that they will be able to make some preliminary report in time for that report to be taken into account when the Council is considering further at a later session the proposal for a Economic Commission for Latin America.

The Commission might, for instance, be able to make some worthwhile remarks on fairly short notice concerning the proper relationship between an economic commission and a specialized agency. However, it is probable that the broader question of the whole relationship of regional commissions to the functional organizations will take a longer period than that which would enable

its full report to be considered at that time.

The New Zealand delegation does feel however very strongly that the basic issues involved in this whole question of regional organizations should be examined. It feels that such a consideration was in mind during the establishment of the Economic Commission for Europe and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East when specific reference was made to the fact in the terms of reference that those terms of reference would be reviewed at a later date. The New Zealand delegation feels that, in view of the scope and importance of the problem, this study of the issues involved in regional commissions should be initiated at an early date. We therefore put before the Council this further resolution contained in document E/537, and we suggest that it should be adopted at the same time as the Council deals with the proposal of the Committee in relation to the Economic Commission for Latin America.

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France) (Interpretation from French): The French delegation will vote for the amendment which has been proposed by the representative of New Zealand. This amendment follows the principle which the French delegation has always held on the question of regional commissions. We have never concealed our reserve on this question, or our desire to avoid regional compartmentation. When the Economic Commissions for Europe and for Asia and the Far East were established, we pointed out from the beginning our conception of the temporary nature of these Commissions, which were destined essentially for reconstruction purposes.

We indicated that it was our idea that the general commissions of the United Nations, the Economic and Employment Commission and Sub-commissions on Employment and Economic Stability and on Development, should treat the different questions. We think there is a real danger of regional autarchy, and we believe that this involves no less a danger than national autarchy.

I must say that much of what I am now saying in the name of the French delegation was, to some extent, anticipated by the remarks of my colleague from Chile who foresaw some of our ideas in the long report which he presented with such clarity. In this report he pointed out -- and we desire to thank him for it -- that the problems of Latin-American countries should be solved in the framework of machinery for dealing with these problems on a universal and world-wide basis. He adduced proofs of this economic unity, and pointed out that during the depression of 1929-1932 the exports of the Latin-American countries, as a whole, dropped by sixty-five per cent as the result of the world-wide depression. There is no doubt that if a similar economic catastrophe should occur tomorrow, no country could preserve the illusion of escaping its effects.

In this connection, I believe that the great economic studies of the United Nations should be carried out in the permanent general commissions of the United Nations, as indicated in the New Zealand proposal, the Economic and Employment Commission and the Sub-commissions on Employment and Economic Stability and on Development. Of course, these commissions might have agencies which would deal with the study of the economic situation in a particular part of the world.

I desire to make these remarks because it might have been expected that the French delegation would not associate itself with this proposal for a commission for Latin-America which has been made by the Chilean representative, but we will not oppose it, inasmuch as we see that this proposal has the support of the majority of the Council. We will not oppose it for several reasons, which I will now make clear so that I shall not have to speak again during the discussion of the New Zealand amendment. We know that the Latin-American representatives on the Economic and Social Council have manifested a desire and, indeed, their impatience, to see this project realized. In view of the amity and the friendship which exists between France and the Latin-American countries, a tradition which is based on cultural affinities as well as on a common conception of the rights of man and on economic and trade relationships, we do not wish to make any gesture which will not take into account the legitimate preoccupations of the Latin-American countries. Further, we note the grave economic difficulties of these countries of Latin-America, which arose from the role these countries played in the struggle against the common enemy. We are also aware of the economic dislocations which have occurred in these countries as a result of excessively developing certain parts of their economy to satisfy the war needs, and neglecting certain other needs, and neglecting the maintenance

RSH/gpr

E/P.V.110
43-45

of industrial equipment, also as a result of the war.

There is no doubt that the wide-spread and effective participation of these countries in the common war quite justifies the attention of the Economic and Social Council, and it is with this feeling that we wish all success to the Commission after it is created by a decision of the Economic and Social Council.

I wish to state that my delegation would hope for the success of the Commission if it is created by a decision of the Council, not only because it will fulfill a work which will conform to the interests of the Latin American countries, but we believe its work will conform to the interests of the world as a whole.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile)(Second interpretation; original in Spanish):

I desire to speak on a matter of procedure. The representative of New Zealand has suggested that his draft resolution should be discussed at the same time as the main resolution submitted by the Drafting Committee.

The representative of France, whom I wish to thank for the kind words he had for the Latin American countries, considered the New Zealand suggestion as an amendment to the proposal made by the Drafting Committee.

We fully recognize that the matter treated in the New Zealand draft resolution is of great importance. It relates to a question which the representative of China brought up before the Council at a formal meeting, and it is certainly very important inasmuch as it considers regional committees and commissions as opposed to functional committees.

Our delegation accepts the draft resolution submitted by the representative of New Zealand, which we consider extremely interesting. We hope that the representative of New Zealand and the representative of France will agree with us when we say that if we were to treat these two resolutions simultaneously, the impression would be created that one was intended to limit the scope of the resolution first submitted by the representative of Chile, and later submitted in an amended form by the Drafting Committee. Therefore, we wish it to be regarded as an entirely separate proposal, and we have no objection to this matter being discussed by the Economic and Employment Commission.

Under these conditions, we wish to suggest that the two draft resolutions be considered as entirely separate resolutions, which would be in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. I do not believe that the two could be treated together.

The PRESIDENT: This draft resolution results, in my opinion, from the proposal made by the representative of Chile. It is an alternative solution of the problem. That is the way the representative of New Zealand presented it.

However, I hope the Members of the Council will refrain from discussing this matter again. We have discussed this problem in many meetings of this Council, and all the Members have made up their minds. Therefore, we should reach a decision with regard to the proposals submitted by the Committee and the representative of New Zealand without re-opening the discussion on the entire problem.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Canada): It seems to me that we must accept the fact that these two resolutions are closely related in substance. They arise out of the same discussion. While I, for my part, have no objection to considering them as separate or joint resolutions, it seems to me it would not be wise to consider them as alternates, one in the place of the other.

I think it would be unfortunate if the impression were to be created that the New Zealand resolution (and I am sure that I have interpreted correctly what was in the mind of the representative of New Zealand) was intended to be substituted for the resolution of the Drafting Committee itself. Whether it is to be interpreted as an amendment to be added to the Drafting Committee resolution or as a separate resolution to be voted upon jointly with the resolution of the Drafting Committee is a matter which, I think, does not need to concern us too greatly.

My preference would be to consider the New Zealand resolution as an addendum, as an additional set of clauses to the resolution of the Drafting Committee. However, if such is your ruling, it could be voted upon as a separate resolution which need not take the place of the resolution of the Drafting Committee.

Having expressed my view on that point, I wish to say very briefly that the statements of the representatives of France and New Zealand have so clearly and adequately expressed the position of the Canadian Government on this matter that it is not necessary for me to add anything to what has been said.

Our opinion on this question of regionalism is well-known and, while we are very anxious to give the fullest and most objective consideration to problems of different areas of the world in the field of economic development and reconstruction, we are anxious to do that in the light of

what the structure of our world organization is and should be in the interest of all the nations.

That is why we feel these two questions contained in these two resolutions are very closely related in principle and in substance and should be considered together and should be forwarded together, in so far as our deliberations upon them are concerned.

There is only one suggestion which I think might be considered in regard to the New Zealand resolution. I am not sure whether at this stage it would be wise to burden the Sub-Commissions of the Economic and Employment Commission, at their first meetings, with a problem as profound in its implications as this one is. It seems to me that it might be more simple and more expeditious, in the long run, to have this question, referred to in the New Zealand resolution, referred to the Economic and Employment Commission itself, rather than to the Sub-Commissions.

Mr. MENDEZ-FRANCE(France)(Interpretation from French): I only wish to make a brief remark. First of all, I wish to apologize to the Council for having used the word "amendment" before. It was the wrong word to use, as my colleague from Chile pointed out.

I leave the decision up to you, Mr. President, on the question of procedure which has come up. However, I should indicate that in the mind of the French delegation the two resolutions which have been presented, that of the Drafting Committee and that of the representative of New Zealand, cannot be considered as alternatives.

In this respect, I completely approve the interpretation which was given by the representative of Canada; namely, that the Council will have to take two separate decisions on these two resolutions.

The PRESIDENT: That being the case, I should like the Members of the Council to state regarding document E/531, if they have any objections. If they have no objections, we could take a decision on that and then pass on to the proposal of the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela)(Interpretation from Spanish): My intention was to speak on the proposal submitted by the representative of New Zealand. As you have ruled that we should now speak on the proposal made by the Drafting Committee, I shall defer whatever I had to say until later. I do not wish to speak about the Report of the Drafting Committee, because our Cuban colleague has already said whatever it was necessary to say about it.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR)(Second interpretation; original in Russian): I do not now wish to discuss the question of the necessity of entrusting an ad hoc committee with this matter. It seems to me

that the proposal of the New Zealand representative replaces the proposal submitted by the Drafting Committee, which resulted from the proposal of the Chilean delegation on the question of the creation of an Economic Commission for Latin America.

As a result of this discussion, we have two proposals: one, in substance, is that this question should be studied by an ad hoc committee and the other is that the question should be referred for study to the Economic and Employment Commission. However, I believe it is not practical to entrust two bodies with the study of the same question simultaneously. It seems to me that no practical results would be derived from entrusting the same question simultaneously to two organs of the United Nations. Accordingly, I consider that the proposals exclude each other, and do not complete each other. The question which is on the agenda is a single question, and it seems to me that a single and definite decision has to be taken on it.

Mr. PERRY (New Zealand): I regret if my explanation this morning has led to some lack of clarity. I should like to make it clear that as I see it both the resolution included in the Drafting Committee's Report and the resolution proposed by the New Zealand delegation can be carried; they are not alternatives.

The procedure suggested by the Drafting Committee is a procedure designed to study the particular problems of Latin America with a view to a decision being taken on the establishment of an Economic Commission for Latin America.

The New Zealand proposal is a proposal for the initiation of a study of the whole question of regional organization, a study which may well extend over a considerable period and which may or may not be of assistance to the Council when it decides on the establishment of a Commission for Latin America. But it is a general study which will be continuous, and in the opinion of the New Zealand delegation it should be started immediately.

Therefore, I would suggest that both of these resolutions can be carried and it is my theory that in the absence of any clear objection to either of the resolutions -- and as far as I can see most of the Council is in agreement with the intent of each resolution -- it should be possible to proceed to vote upon the two resolutions, and without, I hope, too much discussion.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) (Second interpretation; original in Spanish):

I did not think that we were now going to discuss the New Zealand proposal, but I feel inclined to say a few words about it and to explain why my delegation will be obliged to vote against that resolution.

The important point is not whether this is one and the same question or whether there are two questions involved; what is important here is that the various delegations on the Council should maintain the positions they had taken previously in respect of regional organs.

The question appears to me to be whether the creation of an Economic Commission for Latin America is considered advisable at the present time, and this matter should not be considered in the framework of the general problem concerning regional organizations. I fully realize that this is a rather delicate point, and I feel that if we were to vote for the New Zealand proposal now, it would in a considerable measure diminish the scope of the resolution suggested by the Drafting Committee. It would, in other words, be reverting to a position which has already been taken. Some delegations, in expressing their opinions, have stated that they are against the creation of regional organizations, and we should not revert to that point which has already been settled.

The PRESIDENT: If the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to speak on the New Zealand proposal, I would appreciate it if he would do so after we decide on the proposal of the Committee.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR): That is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDENT: We shall then vote on the proposal of the Committee, which is contained in document E/531.

The resolution was adopted by thirteen votes to none, with five abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: Since this resolution has been adopted, two members have to be added to the Committee. We must proceed to the addition of the two members.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba): The position, as I see it, is for the Council to determine now whether it feels that the composition of the ad hoc Committee must be limited to the seven countries which are mentioned in the resolution we have just approved, or whether the Council desires to increase the membership of that Committee to eight, nine, or more Members.

I think that the first point to decide is whether or not we want to keep the membership of the ad hoc Committee limited to seven Members.

The PRESIDENT: The Council voted to have seven Members when it adopted the resolution. The question is whether the Council wishes to increase the number to nine, and as to this point I shall ask the Members of the Council to express their views.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (Second interpretation; original in Spanish): The Chilean delegation suggests that the number of Members on the ad hoc Committee should be ten, which would permit the Economic and Social Council to have representatives representing a number of regions of the world.

The PRESIDENT: There is a proposal that the number should be increased to ten.

Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba): I do not object to the Council's deciding that the ad hoc Committee should have ten Members. However, I wish to call your attention to the part of the Report of the Drafting Committee which says that it considered that the number of Members on such a Committee should not exceed nine. That question was fully discussed, and that was a decision which was agreed upon by the Drafting Committee.

The Council is free, of course, to reverse the decision or recommendation of the Drafting Committee. However, I should like to hear the merits of the proposal that there should be ten Members, because I think that if we have nine Members we can have due representation of the different regions of the world.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (Second Interpretation: Original in Spanish): I do not oppose the suggestion based on the result of the work of the Drafting Committee, in which I participated. I did not make a formal suggestion; I merely thought that a membership of ten would make it possible to satisfy the desire of those countries who have expressed a wish to participate in the work of the ad hoc committee.

The PRESIDENT: We will now vote on the proposal to increase the number of members of the Committee from seven to nine.

The resolution was adopted by twelve votes, to none, with six abstentions.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): Our delegation has particular views on the composition of the ad hoc committee, but before submitting to the Council the names of the two additional countries we had in mind, we should like to know whether it would not be a more convenient procedure to refer this question of nominations to the Drafting Committee which has already worked on this matter.

The PRESIDENT: I prefer to have it settled here, but, if the Council wishes to refer it back to the Committee, I will not insist.

Mr. RADIMSKY (Czechoslovakia): Among the seven countries already appointed to the ad hoc committee, there are, unless I am mistaken, several countries of Asia, but not a single country of Europe. The economic relations between Latin America and Europe are much more important than the economic relations between Latin America and Asia. Therefore, the appointment of an additional member or members from European countries seems to me to be a suggestion against which it would be difficult to raise objections. In this

respect, in the name of my own delegation I have the honour to propose that France be a member of this ad hoc committee.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): Since it has been decided that the appointment of the two additional members will be made here, I wish to explain that the view of my delegation was that Norway and the United Kingdom should be the countries appointed to that ad hoc committee, in addition to the seven members already decided upon. This belief was based on the fact that there is no question about the attention which Norway has given to the consideration of the original Chilean proposal. At all times, the Norwegian delegation has taken an active part in the consideration of that suggestion and we think that because of that, and because of many other reasons such as the relationship Norway has with the Latin American countries in trade and culture and so on, we must support the addition of the representative of Norway to that Committee.

With regard to the United Kingdom, there is no question of the very important economic interests that the United Kingdom has with the Latin American countries, and I think it would be very helpful to have the United Kingdom represented on the ad hoc committee.

In suggesting these two names, I want to make it clear that the proposal which has just been made by our Czechoslovakian colleague is a very agreeable one to us, because there is no doubt of the relations of friendship, culture and trade which exists between France and Latin America. However, I felt that it was my duty, as the representative of my Government here, to express the views my Government had on the two additional members of the ad hoc committee.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (Second interpretation; original in Spanish):

I wish to support the nomination of Norway as an additional Member on the ad hoc committee.

I desire that the Members of the Economic and Social Council should understand my position. I made the suggestion for the creation of such a Commission for Latin-America because I considered that this was necessary. It is quite normal, therefore, that I should prefer to see on the ad hoc committee those countries which have declared themselves to be in favour of the creation of such an Economic Commission for Latin-America, rather than the countries which have opposed that idea. That is the reason why, in the name of my delegation, I support the nomination of Norway.

As to the additional member -- France or the United Kingdom -- either of these countries, in my opinion, would be highly welcome on the committee.

Mr. MOE (Norway): Before a vote is taken, I wish to make the following remark, namely, that the Norwegian delegation, as such, has not expressed any wish to be a member of this ad hoc committee. We have not asked or requested to be a member.

The Norwegian delegation finds itself in a somewhat difficult position. I think there can be no doubt that the two other countries mentioned -- France and the United Kingdom -- have a greater interest in this question than Norway. Our delegation is somewhat unhappy that the Council should be forced to make a choice between Norway, on the one side, and France and the United Kingdom, on the other.

On the other hand, as a loyal Member of the United Nations, Norway is ready to be a member of this committee, especially if that is the desire of the Latin-American countries, with which countries Norway

has always had good and friendly relations.

The PRESIDENT: We have decided on the number of representatives to be on that committee. Could we not decide, without discussing the matter any further, to have ten members there and elect the three who were proposed?

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): Speaking as a representative, and not as Chairman of the Drafting Committee, I should like very much to support the view just expressed by the President.

As I said before, the Drafting Committee favoured the idea that the ad hoc committee should consist only of nine members. However, in view of the fact that there have been three nominations, which are extremely agreeable to us, it seems to me that it would be a very good solution to decide now that the membership of the ad hoc committee should consist of ten countries, and that we should vote on this matter immediately.

Mr. d'ASCOLI (Venezuela) (Second interpretation; original in Spanish):

It is hardly necessary for me to explain the reasons why I prefer small bodies to large bodies: I consider that large bodies are less efficient. However, we are confronted by a special situation. We have had a suggestion that the committee should be composed of ten members and we now have enough nominations to fill these posts. Norway, France and the United Kingdom have been nominated. I believe France and the United Kingdom are especially welcome to this Committee, not exclusively because of their good relations with the Latin American countries but also because it is well known that these two countries have special interests in Latin America.

If we accept that point of view, we come to the logical conclusion that, other than France and the United Kingdom, there is a third country that has comparable interests in Latin America. That country is the Netherlands. The addition of the Netherlands to the committee would mean that the committee would be composed of eleven members.

I repeat, I am against a large number of members on such a body, but this is a particular case and, as the interests of the Netherlands are comparable to those of France and the United Kingdom, we might decide to have a committee of eleven members and add the Netherlands to the countries already cited.

If that suggestion is not accepted, I would suggest we return to our original decision of having a committee consisting of nine members, Norway already being accepted; and then I suggest we proceed to a secret ballot to decide between France and the United Kingdom as the other member of the committee.

Mr. BEYEN (Netherlands): I hope it will not be considered as a lack of appreciation of the proposal of the representative of Venezuela or as a lack of interest in the affairs of Latin America if I say that I think we would be very wise to avoid taking this vote. The Netherlands delegation considers that committees we appoint should not be too large: that is a matter of great importance. Although the Netherlands delegation is very sensitive to what the representative of Venezuela has said, and without any doubt it has a great interest in the work of this committee, a direct interest because of its territories in Latin America, I wonder whether it would not be wise to limit the two representatives of this committee to France and the United Kingdom and thus avoid a vote which to my mind would not serve any good purpose.

Mr. MOROSOV (USSR) (Second interpretation; original in Russian): I should like to direct the attention of the Economic and Social Council to the fact that certain Members of the Council, in advancing candidates as members for the committee, base their nominations on the proposals which they themselves have made. I suggest this is a rather unusual method of creating the composition of a committee of the Economic and Social Council and I believe such a practice and such an approach are not correct.

The PRESIDENT: At this time there are four candidates. We shall vote by secret ballot when we are ready. I should like to pass on to the resolution submitted by the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. MENDES-FRANCE (France)(Interpretation from French): I am in a difficult position with respect to taking part in this discussion. I should ask my colleagues to consider that I speak independently of the fact that my country has been named as a possible Member of this Committee.

If I understand correctly, there are only three countries which have been proposed and which have accepted nominations. The President suggested a little while ago that ten would be the correct number for the Membership of this Committee. It seems to me that the President's proposal corresponded with the feelings of the largest number of Members of the Council.

I wonder if the President's solution is not the wisest one with which to end a situation which is delicate not only for the Members of the Council, but more particularly for those countries which have been suggested as possible Members of this Committee.

The PRESIDENT (Interpretation from French): I am sorry that I am unable to follow the proposal which has been made by the representative of France. But we also have a proposal made by the representative of Venezuela that the Netherlands should also be a Member of this Committee, and that we should vote by secret ballot.

Mr. MOE (Norway): I think this is a very delicate and embarrassing situation. The Norwegian delegation proposes that the vote should be postponed until this afternoon.

Mr. SEN (India): I should agree to a postponement provided there will be no further nominations in the afternoon.

Mr. CHANG (China): I should like to speak with regard to the implementation of the proposal itself. Document E/531/Add.1 contains the implementation to the resolution which we just passed, that is, the estimate of expenses.

There appears to be a very interesting verbal difficulty in paragraph 3 of document E/531/Add.1. The ninth line of that paragraph reads "...as are strictly relevant to making a decision concerning the disability.." There seems to be something wrong with the word "disability."

The PRESIDENT: That is a mistake; the word should be "desirability."

Mr. CHANG (China): Besides that, there is something there we should pay attention to. The part of this paragraph dealing with research was not meant to be closely related to the ad hoc Committee's work. After all, the type of research that will be initiated--even though it will be of a preliminary nature--will be of use far beyond the decision of the ad hoc Committee with regard to the desirability of establishing the Commission for Latin America.

May I just say for the record--and not to be debated on--that perhaps this sentence cannot be interpreted exactly because of the way it is written. By that I mean, it should not be limited only to the decision itself. It should be limited in the preliminary stages to defining and analyzing the economic problems of Latin America. "Should initiate" does not necessarily mean that the commencement of the work may require a dozen people.

WH:cc

E/P.V.110
88-90

I think some money may be saved with regard to the transportation of Members of the ad hoc Committee, because most of the Members, if not all, will probably be in New York. Money can be saved, if that is the case.

The report of this Committee should not only be made with respect to the specific problem, but could also be of great use in other respects concerning the study of the problems of Latin America.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (Second interpretation; original in Spanish):

I wish to support what my colleague from China just stated. In my opinion also the appreciation expressed by the Secretariat in this document does not correspond to the spirit which prevailed in the discussion of this matter.

Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Economic Affairs): It is extraordinarily difficult to frame estimates of this kind because it is not always clear as to the amount of work which a commission of this kind will be required to do. Not until the ad hoc committee meets and begins to work will we form the correct conception of the work which is required. At the same time the Economic Affairs Department does not have any Latin American experts who are not already committed to additional projects. It was necessary therefore to make some provision for additional staff in this estimate. We endeavoured to do so in a modest way, believing that this ad hoc committee is concerned with considering the desirability of creating a Latin American Commission, and in order to make its budget for the work of that Commission it would be necessary for it to have some idea of the leading characteristics of Latin American economy and the outstanding problems which would be the business of the commission to explore. We feel that we can handle this work with the addition of two economists and a secretary unless it is the intention of this Council that the ad hoc committee should go very much further than this and become not merely an ad hoc committee to explore the ground but a kind of preparatory committee for the commission, in which case of course we should have to plan the actual research work which the commission itself would do later on.

We have worked on the assumption, that the ad hoc committee was not the latter but was a committee to explore the question as to whether such a commission was desirable, and to provide the ad hoc committee from the Secretariat with evidence concerning the economic problems of South America which would be the business of the commission to tackle if it was formed. On that basis we think this estimate is sufficient.

There is a certain difficulty about transferring from paragraph 2 to paragraph 3. Paragraph 2 concerns itself with the transportation of commission members. Paragraph 3 is concerned with the budget of the Economic Affairs Department. It is very difficult to transfer from one to the other, but I should like to assure the Council that, unless it is their conception that the ad hoc committee has much wider powers than is my understanding of the situation, the estimate which we have provided would be adequate for the occasion.

Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile) (Second interpretation; original in Spanish): I apologize for speaking again, but this point appears to be of extreme importance.

I have submitted a suggestion for the creation of an Economic Commission for Latin America, and I suggested that that Commission be created immediately and take up its task without further delay. In the course of the discussion, matters of dates and delays crept up, and this led to a compromise proposal made by the representative of Cuba for the creation of an ad hoc Committee. Simultaneously the representative of China suggested that the Secretariat should undertake an immediate survey of the economic situation of Latin America. Accepting the compromise, I understood that in fact the Secretariat would be called upon to proceed with that task without further delay.

I also explained simultaneously in the Drafting Committee that the text as it now appears in this document did not give me satisfaction, and once more the representative of China pointed out in the Committee that these preliminary studies to be undertaken by the Secretariat were absolutely unnecessary.

Today we have before us an estimate presented by the Secretariat which, I agree, does not correspond to the spirit of the debate which was conducted in the Committee.

I regret having to speak again, but I believe that this paper as we have it before us is not at all in accordance with the spirit of the discussion in the Committee.

The PRESIDENT: It seems to me that the Secretariat needs clearer guidance from this Council, and if there are no objections,

then it is agreed that the Secretariat should follow whatever was said in this connection by the representatives of China and Chile.

Mr. PEREZ-CISNEROS (Cuba): I want only to say that I associate myself with the remarks made by the representatives of China and Chile.

I think there was no basis for the interpretation which has been given by the Secretariat to the resolution proposed by the Drafting Committee. I think that, if we read carefully the resolution, the Secretary-General is requested "to give special and immediate aid to the Committee by initiating studies defining and analyzing the economic problems of Latin American countries which threaten the stability and development of their economies."

We do not find in that text, which is a very concrete one, the ideas expressed in the paper submitted to us by the Secretariat, where it is said that the work of the Secretariat "should be limited to an examination of such elements in the economy of Latin America as are strictly relevant to making a decision concerning the desirability of establishing the suggested Economic Commission ..."

My position on this subject is as follows: We are not interested in seeing the Secretariat appoint two, three, eight, ten, or twenty experts; what we want is the compliance of the Secretariat with the request which is incorporated here in the recommendation made by the Drafting Committee; that is, that the Secretariat initiate studies "defining and analyzing the economic problems of Latin American countries which threaten the stability

and development of their economies." It says that they^{should}/initiate studies. They may initiate studies with two experts, and later on, if it is found necessary, they may have a third expert added.

However, in no event am I prepared to accept the interpretation which the Secretariat has given in document E/531/Add.1.

Mr. THORP (United States): I should like to say that in voting for document E/531 I was thoroughly aware of the addendum and the statement by the Secretary-General. I did not feel that there was a clear-cut inconsistency at that point, but I thought the Secretary-General was saying that he did not propose to start a comprehensive survey -- by which I would assume he meant taking on a large staff and moving ahead on a great many problems at the stage of immediate activity -- but that he did propose to add to the people that he already had economists who would specifically work on the problem of defining and analyzing the general economic conditions and problems of Latin America.

It is necessary for this Committee to have assistance from the Secretary-General in developing its terms of reference. It has to be advised with respect to the character, the extent and the nature of the economic problems with which it will have to deal. Similarly, before any comprehensive survey is actually initiated at the survey point, there has to be planning and analysis in preparation for it, so that I had not felt, in reading the two documents, that there was the kind of inconsistency which some of the other Members of the Council found to be present.

MF/ehs

E/P.V.110
99-100

It would seem to me that even if one at this time were deciding to undertake a very extensive project or a series of projects with respect to Latin America, it would be wise, as the Secretary-General apparently plans to do, to put a small group to work at the planning level, and then the comprehensive survey would follow once that planning had been done.

I hope that my interpretation is not inconsistent with the interpretation of the Secretary-General. It seems to me that the programme proposed -- though it may have some unfortunate words in it -- can very readily be interpreted in a way which would meet the proposal of the Drafting Committee. It was with that interpretation in mind that I voted for the resolution which was before us.

Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Economic Affairs): I should like to assure the representative of the United States that his interpretation of the Secretariat's intention contained in this document is an accurate one. The Secretariat, with due regard to the over-riding considerations of economy which govern the proceedings of this institution, tried to prepare an estimate which was as moderate as possible, compatible with the carrying out of the intentions of the Council. We feel we have done that.

I have been to this Council on three occasions with modest estimates, and have found these estimates have been criticised severely for their modesty. I wonder whether it might not be a wiser course to take the advantage which some resolutions of the Council give, and present estimates calling for very large increases in staff. Personally, I do not consider it my duty so to do. I think that, in considering the Council's resolution, the Secretariat's duty is to present an estimate which is as reasonable and as modest as possible.

The PRESIDENT: Before passing to the next point, I should like to ask the representative of New Zealand, in connection with his draft resolution, whether he insists on having this adopted during this session. To my mind, there is a question whether it is in order or not, but it is related to the problem which we were just discussing. However, it is so wide, and the Commission will not be able to prepare a study on the subject because the regional commissions have only just begin their work, that I wonder whether they would not prefer to present it as an independent item for the next session of the Council.

Mr. PERRY (New Zealand): As the New Zealand delegation sees it, this proposal arose directly out of an item which was on the agenda for this session of the Council. As I understood the discussion which took place earlier this morning, a question of procedure was suggested, but I understood it was settled that it was to be dealt with on this occasion.

Perhaps I should say a word about one matter. I did not suggest at all that the Economic and Employment Commission, or its Sub-Commissions, should endeavour to present a comprehensive report on this matter to the next session of the Council, or the session thereafter, but I think they should initiate a study of the question as soon as possible.

I have no doubt that the next report of the Economic and Employment Commission to this Council will cover a survey and outline of how this whole problem should be approached and exactly what is involved in it. I think it is necessary for that to be started as soon as possible. I should therefore hope that it might be possible to proceed with this item at this session.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union asked to be heard on this question. If there are no other speakers, we could dispose of this item. However, if there are other speakers, then we shall adjourn and discuss the matter in the afternoon.

Mr. MALIK (Lebanon): In view of the fact that some Members have already spoken with regard to this point, such as the representatives of France and Canada, I think it is only fair to allow the other Members to express themselves.

The PRESIDENT: That is why I am enquiring whether any of the Members desire to speak.

Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile)(Second interpretation: original in Spanish): In the name of my delegation, I should like to thank my colleagues on the Council for the attention they have given to the proposal made by the Chilean delegation and for the way in which the debates have been conducted.

The PRESIDENT: We shall continue the discussion with regard to document E/537 this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 2:11 p.m.