

OFFICIAL REPORT  
of the  
UNITED STATES DELEGATION  
to the  
SECOND INTER-AMERICAN TECHNICAL  
MEETING ON HOUSING AND PLANNING  
LIMA - PERU  
November 18 to November 27, 1958

the Administrator  
Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

Submitted to the SECRETARY OF STATE

Walker Mason  
Chairman of the Delegation

Prepared by: Roy J. Burroughs  
Vice Chairman of the Delegation

Ervan R. Bueneman  
Secretary of the Delegation

Contributors:  
Temple C. Dick (ICA/Guatemala)  
Paul A. Foster (ICA/Nicaragua)  
Geo. W. Williams (ICA/British  
Honduras)

Official Report of the United States Delegation

to the

Second Inter-American Technical Meeting

on Housing and Planning

1. BACKGROUND

The Second Inter-American Technical Meeting on Housing and Planning held in Huampani, Peru from November 18 to 27, 1958 was convoked by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council for the purpose of advising through the Council the governments of the participating states on planning and housing. Concurrently over a two day period the Inter-American Society of Planning Officials met. Many delegates attended both meetings.

2. AGENDA

TOPIC I - HOUSING OF SOCIAL INTEREST

- A. Exchange of information on the development of programs relating to housing of social interest, with special reference to: legislation, financing arrangements, administrative procedures, technical advances, and cooperative organizations.
- B. Exchange of information on experiences relating to the organization of housing institutions.
- C. Building materials and methods, with special reference to: the use of local materials, methods and labor, the establishment of specialized industries, technical standards, and transportation.

TOPIC II - URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

- A. Study of the problems presented by the unrestricted expansion of cities as a consequence of migration to them, including the use and utilization of physical factors and natural resources.
- B. Study of shack towns: Economic and social programs designed to eliminate their causes; provisional emergency measures; complete eradication or transformation.
- C. Professional training in the field of planning.
- D. Education and civic action.

TOPIC III - INTER-AMERICAN TECHNICAL ACTIVITY IN THE FIELDS  
OF HOUSING AND PLANNING

- A. Programs, cooperation, and liaison arrangements.
- B. Special topics recommended by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council.
- C. Organization and seat of the Third Meeting.

3. PARTICIPATION

A. Countries represented by official delegations:

Argentina	-	13 delegates
Bolivia	-	5 delegates
Brazil	-	2 delegates
Chile	-	7 delegates
Colombia	-	4 delegates
Costa Rica	-	2 delegates
Cuba	-	2 delegates
Dominican Republic	-	1 delegate
Ecuador	-	4 delegates
El Salvador	-	2 delegates
United States	-	10 delegates
Guatemala	-	1 delegate
Nicaragua	-	1 delegate
Panama	-	1 delegate
Peru	-	23 delegates
Uruguay	-	3 delegates
Venezuela	-	1 delegate

B. Countries represented by observers:

Mexico - Jorge Woorduin, Architect, National Institute  
of Housing

C. International organizations represented:

Organization of American States	- 6 delegates
Pan-American Office of Sanitation	- 3 observers
International Organization of Labor	- 2 observers
Pan-American Institute of Geography and History	- 1 observer
Pan-American of the Association of Engineers	- 1 observer
Inter-American Economic and Social Council	- 1 delegate
Inter-American Society of Planners	- 4 observers

Note: The reference for documenting the above participants is Document #23  
dated November 18, 1958 original issue in Spanish.

4. UNITED STATES DELEGATION

Delegate:

The Honorable  
Walker Mason, (Chairman)  
Deputy Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency,  
Washington, D. C.

Alternate Delegate:

Roy J. Burroughs  
International Housing Adviser  
Housing and Home Finance Agency  
Washington, D. C.

Advisers:

Carlos M. Alvarado  
Executive Vice President  
Puerto Rico Planning Board  
Santurce, Puerto Rico

Stanley Baruch  
Chief, Latin American Branch, Housing Division  
International Cooperation Administration  
Washington, D. C.

Ervan R. Bueneman  
Housing Adviser, United States Operations Mission to  
the Eastern Caribbean  
Trinidad, B.W.I.

Temple C. Dick  
Housing Adviser, United States Operations Mission to Guatemala  
Guatemala City, Guatemala

Paul A. Foster  
City Planning and Housing Adviser  
United States Operations Mission to Nicaragua  
Managua, Nicaragua

Edmund H. Hoben  
Housing Adviser, United States Operations Mission to Costa Rica  
San Jose, Costa Rica

Harold Robinson  
Housing Adviser, United States Operations Mission to Chile  
Santiago, Chile

George W. Williams  
Housing Adviser, United States Operations Mission to British Honduras  
Belize, British Honduras

NOTE: Known to have been present as observers were:

Raymond Foley, former Administrator of HHFA, and Harry Newcomb, both representing International Basic Economy Corporation which received an invitation to send observers; Walter Harris of Department of City Planning, Yale University; Elisio Font of the Puerto Rican office of the Urban Renewal Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; and Rafael Corrada of the Corporacion de Vivienda, Puerto Rico.

5. ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE

A. Principal Officers

President:

Mr. Eduardo Dibos  
Minister of Public Works and Chairman of the Delegations  
of Peru

Vice-President:

The chairman of participating delegations served as Vice-Presidents of the conference during the absence of the President according to the order of precedence based on lot established in accordance with Article No. 13 of the Regulations of the Second Inter-American Technical Meeting on Housing and Planning.

Secretary General:

Mr. David Vega Christie, Lima, Peru

B. The U. S. Delegation were assigned to Committees or "Commissions" as follows:

Committee I - Housing of Social Interest:

Mr. Edmund Hoben  
Mr. George W. Williams  
Mr. Temple Dick  
Mr. Mason also gave much time to this Committee

Committee II - Urban and Regional Planning:

Mr. Carlos Alvarado  
Mr. Paul Foster

Committee III - Inter-American Activities in the Field of Housing and Planning:

Mr. Harold Robinson  
Mr. Burroughs spent much time negotiating problems of this Committee

6. WORK OF THE COMMITTEES

A. Commission I on Housing of Social Interest:

This committee was divided into the following working Sub-Committees:

A sub-committee was established for the purpose of exploring the use of local indigenous building materials and the methods for utilizing these materials in the construction of low-cost housing.

This committee further studied the best procedures for establishing specialized building material industries which would in addition to encouraging the development of housing also would benefit other phases of a country's economy.

A sub-committee was installed for the purpose of discussing and reviewing the experiences of the member delegations in the organization of Housing Agencies.

This committee worked on the basic premise that a direct exchange of experience and information among the members would improve the implementation of administrative procedures and the organization of National Housing and Planning Agencies.

The third sub-committee of this Committee was formed to exchange information on matters of Legislation, Finance, Development of Cooperative Organization and the Intensifying of Inter-American Technical Activities.

It was hoped that the exchange of experiences in these fields would make it possible for the various members to take advantage of the positive contributions to these aspects of housing development made by the various member countries.

In substance, the following comments were made by Mr. Dick concerning the sub-committee on building materials and methods:

It appears to the writer that whereas many other committees may well be concerned with organizational structure, this committee should have dealt with fundamentals concerning materials and construction methods. Instead, practically all discussion and resolutions resulting therefrom, related to the gathering and dissemination of such material through CINVA.

The only approach to materials appeared indirectly as related to "Pre-fabrication." This subject came up so often and was just as often turned aside by whichever U. S. observer was present, that upon their request, I met with the delegates from

Chile, Argentina and Bolivia in a separate session. In that session it developed that "Pre-fabrication" is not the formidable billion dollar enterprise that we seem to think they mean. As they used the term, they mean almost any degree of pre-cutting, pre-assembly, panelization, etc., of components rather than factory fabrication of entire houses.

In brief, I think future committees such as this ought to be relieved of other than technical considerations. Everyone there individually was full of technical ideas and enthusiastic about talking about them. I think concentrated technical discussions and summary thereof would serve a better purpose than the material to which the group addressed itself.

In substance the following comments were made by Mr. Williams concerning the sub-committee on building materials and methods:

The first group meeting began with discussions concerning the general need of more technical skills such as carpentry, cement work, plumbers, etc. The continuous migration of farm people into large cities who have had no previous experience in building establishes a need for special instruction. The delegates felt it would be advisable that technical courses in mechanical skills be offered.

Another area of great concern involved methods to provide more housing for the large number of people of low income often with subsidy from governments. Some delegates argued that if homes are provided they also should be furnished in order to raise the level of living of people without any great additional cost; that people should not be required to move to a new home unless at the same time new furniture were provided to make the home complete and more livable.

In the opinion of the writer with the present capacity for payment so small, it will be difficult if not impossible to obtain such an objective.

The writer made some observations to show how people might be encouraged to contribute to their own social development by making greater utilization of present resources and capital through manual training classes, home economics instruction, boys and girls club activities, adult classes, etc. His feeling is that the people can not buy economic development or security by spending more cash immediately but through consistent savings and greater use of family labor and cooperative efforts.

Another topic which received considerable attention was the necessity for technological development and industrialization. It is felt by many Delegations that governments, private institutions, and industry should conduct research into the methods and techniques of building construction and disseminate this information to their small

building contractors. Also, it was suggested that CINVA in Bogota might be helpful in periodically reporting results of experiences in better methods of construction. It is felt that such information might be used to a great advantage in most South American countries. The question arose as to the adaptability of various types of construction techniques and methods now being used in the building industry; also the place and perhaps importance of Aided Self-Help programs. In the opinion of the writer, techniques to be used depend on conditions which vary from country to country. Whereas a country has very little capital but adequate natural resources and a desire on the part of the people to help themselves, the Aided Self-Help technique might be used effectively in building homes. On the other hand there was a considerable feeling that new housing developments might be built by governments or other institutions and sold on a long-term payment plan. This requires large sums of money which most countries do not have and it also lessens family participation.

A need was expressed for greater use of social workers in programs of housing development so as to acquaint people with better living standards and motivations for work.

There was continued feeling on the part of two Delegates that homes should be provided to their people without serious consideration as to the financial consequences, technological problems, or social disorganization. A majority of the Delegates, however, did not agree with this thesis and recommended that more consideration be given to the social aspects of housing development. It was felt that the people themselves will not appreciate and not use effectively things which were given to them without any effort on their part. A motion was proposed which recommended that housing development proceed without consideration of the social implications. The majority of the Delegates voted to kill the resolution because experience had been that technical programs should not be attempted on a large scale without advice and planning of competent social workers.

The topic of modular coordination was discussed by the Delegates but it was impossible for the writer to attend those particular sessions.

The report by J. Robert Dodge, US-HHFA, on research in building materials and methods in the United States stimulated a great deal of interest and discussion. Many questions were asked concerning programs of research and methods for disseminating information to contractors and local builders and the general public. The writer believes this Dodge report furnishes the answer to many problems now confronting both the newly developing and more developed countries of South America.

B. Commission II on Urban and Regional Planning

This committee was sub-divided into four sub-committees:

A Sub-Committee was formed for the study of problems resulting from the unrestricted expansion of urban areas.

Included in the work of this sub-committee was the exchange of information and one objective analysis of programs of proper land use in urban areas and also how the natural resources of a city could best be utilized for programs of social, economic, and physical development.

A Sub-Committee was formed for the purpose of exploring the reasons for the creation and the procedures for eliminating "Shack Towns."

The existence of these "Shack Towns" has resulted from an aggravation of already serious housing problems caused by the migration of rural families to urban zones. They lack even the minimum amount of public services and utilities and create an extremely heavy load on the already over-extended public services provided by the Municipality or Government. This sub-committee explored and exchanged information on types of economic or social programs which could best be devised to eradicate these "Shack Towns" and possibly even more important eliminate the causes behind their existence.

A Committee was formed for the exploration of the best means of developing professional training in the field of planning.

This topic was given a high priority by the Program of Technical Cooperation of the Organization of American States. This committee used as a guide to the study of this problem the basic premise that it was necessary that better use be made of existing facilities. This could lead to a more comprehensive and intensive professional planning educational program at various professional levels of government.

A Committee was formed for the development of education and civic action.

Realizing that the cooperation and participation of the people for whom a plan is being prepared is vital to the preparation and implementation of any Master Urban Plan, this committee was formed to study and discuss basic civic training at all levels of education both within and outside formal educational systems.

The substance of comments by Mr. Foster on the work of this sub-committee follows:

The Committee began meetings on the morning of the 19th with twelve countries present. Later on two more countries joined the meeting. After the President, Secretary, and Reporter were elected, a schedule was developed to discuss the four Sub-Topics, as per the agenda.

During the rest of the morning session, the discussion was concerned with generalities of cause and effects of the rapid rate of migration from rural areas to urban centers in Latin America. The first indication of concern for more productive discussion came at the end of the morning session when a resolution was proposed that the report prepared by the CINVA (October Seminar) be used as a basis for discussion of the topic. A second proposal even suggested that this report be adopted as/or modified as the standard of the committee. It was also proposed that all countries be given a chance to give their ideas on the causes of exodus from rural areas in their country and to ask the Census Bureaus in the respective countries to include questions on this migration in the 1960 census.

The session was recessed and it was agreed that the time would be used for all delegates of the Commission to become familiar with the CINVA report.

On the 20th there were both morning and afternoon sessions and the delegates for the first time really began to get down to business. The Committee was divided into two sub-committees and each given several topics to draft for presentation to the plenary session.

These draft resolutions included the following:

1. That National Planning Agencies be created in order to assist local planning agencies in their work and to sponsor regional planning.
2. That the delegates request their governments to take appropriate steps to increase the effectiveness and autonomy of local governments, particularly with broader resources from taxes so as to make it easily possible to undertake the necessary public works proposed by planning programs.
3. That the member states take action to modify any traditional physical, economic or administrative institution, that hinders rational development and to decentralize distribution of work centers and energy resources more in accordance with actual population distribution.

4. That questions on rural to urban migration be included in the 1960 census to be taken by all countries.

Other very general draft resolutions were also prepared.

On the 21st above resolutions 1 and 2 and a general one on urban renewal were approved for submission to the plenary session.

The only important participation by the writer in the discussion was a statement to the effect that in view of the extreme shortage of qualified planners and the rather pressing need for taking action to solve the problems caused by lack of urban planning programs, serious consideration should be given to the possible ill effects of any proposals that might split these limited numbers of technicians between national and urban planning programs.

It was pointed out that the concern over the lack of powerful local governments could actually be a benefit rather than a hindrance to urban planning as the planners could participate effectively in developing these deficiencies in conformance with broad urban planning considerations. In contrast to this, any effort to plan on a national scale would conflict in attempting to coordinate and program the activities of such old established governed agencies as highway departments, agricultural ministries, education and health ministries, and so forth.

C. Committee on Inter-American Technical Activity in the Field of Housing and Planning:

The following Sub-Committees were organized:

A sub-committee was set up to explore procedures for initiating a more effective means for a cooperative exchange of technological data among various national technical institutions and for improving liaison arrangements among the member states.

Another sub-committee dealt with special subjects referred by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council.

One working committee was appointed to propose a set of principles for review and acceptance by the parent committee and the Conference.

Another working committee was established to determine the feasibility of specialized technical conferences.

A committee to suggest the organization and seat of the third meeting was established by the Committee on Inter-American Technical Activity in the Field of Housing and Planning.

The chief function of this committee was to make suggestions on this subject.

Summary of Work of Commission III

The United States was represented by Harold Robinson (ICA/Chile) with Burroughs also in attendance part of time and taking over the second week after Robinson left. U. S. was not asked to serve on working groups; nor did U. S. volunteer. Rather U. S. worked outside the groups to influence action, especially with respect to the status of future Technical Meetings as Specialized Conferences (Res. 29) and to a Colombian resolution on the proposed Inter-American financial institution (Res. 32). Each took considerable negotiation, especially the latter. Jorge Videla, Economist of CINVA, on request of U. S. proved to be a helpful intermediary between U. S. and other delegations because of his professional competence, skill in both languages, and capacity to mediate.

On the future status of meetings, initial opposition to the Specialized Conference structure was strong. The plan was described as complicated and impractical. Solow (PAU) made an explanatory statement to the Commission as did Dr. Glower (IA-ECOSOC) but without recommendation. At this stage U. S. distributed copies of draft resolution prepared in rough by S. Wilson (State) with stipulation that it be regarded as a working document for guidance of discussions but that the U. S. did not wish to appear as sponsor. After much give-and-take, the final resolution, credited to the Commission III as a whole, seems to reflect the essentials of the Wilson draft. U. S. made no statement on the subject in either Commission or Plenary. (The revised Wilson draft (by letter) and cable arrived only after final action had been taken in plenary session.)

The initial Colombian resolution on IA-financial institution for development was introduced very early and without a prior consultation which U. S. had requested of them. The resolution strongly urged that a specific fraction of all loans by the institution be required to be set aside for housing. However, following private consultations, Colombia quickly withdrew its initial resolution and introduced a resolution acceptable to U. S. Andrade of Colombia even threatened to withdraw his resolution entirely when it appeared there might be crippling amendments unacceptable to U. S. (particularly various and changing ideas suggested by Lasalla of Argentine). Just before the Commission meeting to pass on the resolution, it appeared the working group apparently dominated by Argentine, had put it in a form which would not be acceptable to U. S. or Colombia. Upon a long conference of U. S. and Argentine, an acceptable resolution was drafted and introduced in Commission III. Then Lasalla, (Argentine) with permission of his Chief Delegate, introduced a confusing amendment about limiting loans to production goods. A long and acrimonious debate then occurred--U. S. keeping silent. Finally, U. S. made a statement on the role of housing in economic development and the lack of a U. S. position at this time on the future role of the proposed institution. Then U. S. suggested that the phrase "as a contribution to economic development" be added to the enacting clause of the resolution. This was accepted by Argentine and adopted unanimously without further discussion.

The resulting resolution which then was unanimously adopted in plenary without further discussion, complies with the Position Paper directing U. S. to take no position as to the future role of the institution. U. S. merely agreed to a recommendation which requests the pertinent body to give "consideration" among its possible operations to the need in the field of housing and community facilities.

The development of a set of "principles of housing" was handled by a working group very quietly and without contact with U. S. United States sought, through Messrs. Solow and Sanudo (PAU) and others, to let delegations know that U. S. had a prepared position which did not include deviation from principles developed in the 10th Conference or First Technical Meeting - one or the other. Solow understood that only minor changes were being made in the four principles of the First Technical Meeting. When the draft finally reached the Commission, it represented a marked change. While complimenting sponsors for their serious and able effort to produce a satisfactory set of principles, U. S. abstained with an explanation that U. S. Government did not adhere to such sweeping expressions of policy without serious consideration; that the Delegation came with specific instructions from which it could not deviate without additional instruction for which no time remained. There was some grumbling that U. S. had gone along in the 10th Conference and the First Technical Meeting.

In plenary at the request of Uruguay, the U. S. explanation for abstention had to be repeated. Opening with a thank you to Uruguay for giving U. S. this opportunity, the U. S. position was stated as instructed. On inquiry of Solow, USDEL indicated that U. S. Ambassador to IA-ECOSOC could express the U. S. position later, if and when called upon. It is a moot issue whether the statement would be acceptable in light of U. S. policy (Housing Act of 1949) to rely mainly on private enterprise to attain its objective of a "decent home and suitable living environment for every American family."

Commission III as such did not actively negotiate the time and place of the next meeting because the heads of delegations undertook this informally. The Relators of the Commission merely introduced their decision in Plenary. This is covered fully in Highlights item below.

## 7. WORK OF THE CONFERENCE

### A. HIGHLIGHTS

1. U. S. attained the unanimous acceptance of its objective with respect to recommendations for the future operation of the Inter-American Financing Institution for Development (Res. 32) and the future status of technical meetings as Specialized Conferences (Res. 29). Hard and almost continuous negotiations were necessary throughout the conference on the finance resolution but it passed the plenary session of the last day without debate or comment from the floor. However, the Relator of Commission III mentioned in his report to plenary session that U. S. had offered a compromise amendment in Commission III which was unanimously adopted by delegations previously in disagreement.

2. U. S. failed of its purpose to avoid another (third) set of "Principles of Housing" (Res. 1) for possible recommendation to the 11th Inter-American Conference. This third set of principles was at too much variance with those of the 10th Conference and First Technical Meeting for United States to accept without violating instructions. Time did not permit consultation with the Department; hence United States abstained.
3. The most important results of the meeting were the increased bonds of mutual understanding and the exchange of information and ideas which occurred during informal contacts and in the course of consideration of pending resolutions in Commissions and Working Groups.
4. The whole business of the meeting including Commissions was devoted to discussions of resolutions proposed by various delegations or Working Groups. It is believed that introduction of most of the resolutions was motivated by a desire of the sponsoring delegations to use the Conclusions of the meeting as a device for attaining certain ends in domestic politics. The resulting resolutions may or may not have significance to others than the sponsors but other countries gave support to avoid offense or to assure support for their own pet resolutions.
5. In many, if not all matters, it is believed most delegations came uninstructed. One gets the impression that delegations expect to be rated by their home governments somewhat in proportion to the number of resolutions each could count to its credit. The genuine interest delegates expressed informally in the exchange of information and ideas had to manifest itself to a considerable degree in conversations outside of the meetings. Some delegates were convinced that seminars are more useful for exchange of ideas than formal technical meetings. The United States Delegate, Mr. Walker Mason, Deputy Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, was told by Mr. Solow (Pan-American Union) that various delegations wished to hear him discuss any lessons from United States experience with housing which might be useful to Latin America. Mr. Mason made preparations to speak at a plenary session but time did not permit him to do so. He participated throughout the Meeting in Commission I concerned with "Housing."
6. In discussing informally with various delegates, how future meetings could be more useful, Roy Burroughs described operations of the Housing Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe. There was no suitable opening at a plenary session to discuss the matter with all delegations. Solow (PAU) agrees that the Provisional Advisory and Organizing Committee proposed for setting up Specialized Conferences can establish more satisfactory agendas and procedures for future meetings and in so doing give consideration to European experience.

7. Concerning place and time of next meeting (Res. 36) Rafael Pico of Puerto Rico told Mr. Mason that the Governor of Puerto Rico awaited a reply to his suggestion that Puerto Rico be the place of the next meeting in May 1960 in conjunction with meetings of International Confederation of Housing and Planning and the Inter-American Planning Society. Pico stressed desire of delegates to the planning meetings to also serve at the same time as delegates to the Inter-Governmental meeting so that their expenses would be paid. To assure that, if necessary, United States would be able to maintain good relations with Latin Americans on this issue, United States Delegate cabled State Department for instructions. In the meantime, an informal meeting of heads of delegations met to decide place and date outside of plenary session. Argentine and Chile both strongly bid for the meeting. A committee was appointed to thrash out the issue. United States was not on the committee. The committee decided on a compromise which was adopted in the next meeting of heads of delegations and formally in plenary. Chile is proposed as site of the Third Technical Meeting (or Specialized Conference) in second half of 1961. Argentine is proposed as site of a seminar during last quarter of 1960. The subject would be "the importance of housing in economic development." The intent seems to be for the seminar of specialists in Housing and Planning to prepare a document which would be circulated to governments prior to and become the principal topic for the Third Technical Meeting.
8. An undercurrent of maneuvering between delegations seeking to strengthen CINVA at expense of the rest of the housing program of Pan-American Union and vice versa was noted. (Letter Mason to Dulles).
9. There was a lively discussion in a plenary session of the merits of aided self-help housing programs. The Argentine delegation, dominated by an autonomous but governmental building organization introduced a resolution asking that CINVA evaluate aided self-help. It prejudged the issue in the preface adversely to self-help by saying that it was in opposition to industrialization. USDEL pointed out, among other things, that aided self-help instead of being opposed to industrialization is often a first step in the process of training foremen and craftsmen who some times establish themselves as contractors after they learn through actual building operations of aided self-help. Several delegations stressed aided self-help as the only possible way their own country could make a start toward solution of housing problems for families of low income.
10. Mr. Walker Mason was interviewed for a broadcast over the Voice of the Americas. (See attachments). He answered briefly in about 10 or 15 minutes three questions:

1. What in your opinion accounts for the success of the Housing Program of the United States of America?
2. Is there any experience which the people of the U. S. have had that could prove useful to housing and planning in Latin America?
3. What can be done in Inter-American Specialized Meetings of the Organization of American States such as you are now attending, to improve housing and planning in Latin America?

**B. SUMMARY OF RESOLUTIONS AND U. S. VOTING RECORD**

The conference passed forty-two resolutions. The provisional Final Report makes no reference to the voting, pro, con, or abstention. A summary of resolutions and the U. S. voting record of 36 ayes and 6 abstentions is set forth below. It should be noted that resolutions usually reached the plenary sessions without an English version. Only two or three times did U. S. insist on an English version. In the final plenary, resolutions were acted upon so swiftly that it proved difficult to decide with sufficient care concerning the U. S. voting, especially since we were dependent on the Spanish text and the oral English translation as the enacting clauses were read. On the whole the "whereas" clauses were not read in the meeting. The final form in which resolutions reached the plenary session were not necessarily those that had been viewed in committees by members of USDEL because there was much last minute changing. The English versions often read somewhat differently than the oral translation given by the interpreters at the time the resolutions were before the plenary sessions. The provisional version of resolutions contains many poorly worded resolutions in the English version.

Resolution I - Recommends a declaration of principles of housing--"inalienable right of man"--not an "end but a means" for improved living--"responsibility of society"--requires "integral planning," just "distribution of wealth," "economic and social development"--"coordination" of international action for above ends.

US ABSTAINED--with explanation that statement departed from instructed position which would have permitted acceptance or minor modification of previously passed principles of Tenth Conference of First Technical Meeting. Emphasized that U. S. could not adhere to such sweeping declaration without prior consultation within U. S. Government.

Resolution II - Recommends technological research with a "percentage of the amount allocated to housing construction" to be used for the purpose.

US ABSTAINED--with explanation that it was beyond the competence of USDEL to recommend specific tax legislation to U. S. Congress without prior consultation with U. S. Government.

Resolution III - Proposed exchange of information looking to ultimate standardization of building components.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution IV - Requested that CINVA evaluate aided self-help.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution V - Recommended that member states be asked to submit reports on progress in achieving recommendations made by previous technical meeting.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution VI - Recommends that CINVA send semi-annual questionnaires to member states concerning their housing activity and that CINVA evaluate and publish results.  
US SUPPORTED (This may prod member governments into maintaining and improving their housing statistics.)

Resolution VII - Recommends that governments do not give houses away except perhaps in cases of disaster.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution VIII - Recommends a broad integrated approach to problems of rural housing.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution IX - Recommends organization of savings and lending institutions for housing and avoidance of inflation by governments.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution X - Recognizes the gap between ability to pay and cost of housing; suggests studies of the problem, and indicates need for channeling resources into housing compatible with investment and development of each country.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution XI - Recommends sufficient autonomy for institutions in charge of housing for families of low income so that they can operate effectively.  
US SUPPORTED (Mr. Mason believes the local housing authorities of the U. S. have this autonomy).

Resolution XII - Recommends intensification of technological research by CINVA within its regular program and improved cooperation by member governments with CINVA in this field.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution XIII - Suggests that the Inter-American Statistical Institute give consideration to problem of taking a census of workers in building industry.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution XIV - Recommends that national programs for economic development consider decentralization of employment to avoid unrestricted growth of cities.

US SUPPORTED (Now upon reading the English text more carefully, there is some doubt as to the merit of the resolution. Each situation requires careful analysis of comparative costs of production in different geographical areas. Urban growth may be the most economical response to ecological problems.)

Resolution XV - Recommends national, regional and local planning for effective land use and development; also a tax on urban land proportional to "number of lots owned and the length of ownerships."

US ABSTAINED with explanation that such a tax would inhibit developmental building on a large scale which is one major means for reducing costs of housing in the USA.

Resolution XVI - Recommends that CINVA and Inter-American Statistical Institute collaborate in preparation of census questions which would be useful in regional and urban planning.

US SUPPORTED

Resolution XVII - Recommends that CINVA in cooperation with member states provide for exchange of information on planning activities and legislation.

US SUPPORTED

Resolution XVIII - Recommends that budget officials at national, regional, and local levels consider plans drafted by planning agencies in preparation of budgets.

US SUPPORTED

Resolution XIX - Recommended establishment of a national planning agency in each country, regional planning agencies, local planning agencies, metropolitan planning agencies, and integration thereof.

US ABSTAINED with an explanation that while members of the delegation as housing and planning people were sympathetic with the objectives of the resolution, USDEL could not support the resolution because the Congress abolished the National Resources Planning Board some years ago and consequently we must view a national planning agency at this time as inconsistent with domestic policy.

Resolution XX - Recommended that governments adopt urban renewal programs. (Meaning something similar to program of U. S.)

US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXI - Recommended local agencies for housing and urban renewal.

US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXII - Recommended that investments in housing fit into plans for economic development and consider problem of needy sectors of the economy.

US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXIII - Recommended that local governments be elected by general election, that local governments be provided ample resources for carrying out urban plans, and that undertakings within local communities by regional or national governments be in keeping with the local urban plan.

US ABSTAINED with a statement that U. S. already had such a system of local representation but that it did not wish to interfere in the constitutional policy of other governments.

Resolution XXIV - Recommended planning of urban areas so as to contribute to economic development.

US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXV - Recommended that high priority be given to "Project 23" of the Program of Technical Cooperation of OAS concerning establishment of regional educational institutes for planning; that evaluation be made of resources toward this end, and that support be given universities in Latin America which train professionals in this field.

US SUPPORTED - (but at first stated an abstention on the ground that U. S. had not settled its position concerning the decentralization of planning activities because of a possibility that CINVA might thus be weakened. Thereupon one delegation (Chile?) stated that US already had approved this undertaking through its approval of Project 23 in the IA-ECOSOC. USDEL asked Solow of PAU if this were true. He said it was so. Thereupon USDEL withdrew its abstention but indicated that it would make further inquiries about the matter in Washington.)

Resolution XXVI - Recommended that the report of seminar held by CINVA on planning be distributed widely and that seminar be given a high priority and coordinated with Technical Meetings.

US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXVII - Recommended collaboration on programs to promote "community development" (perhaps in the ICA and United Nations sense of the phrase) and recommended regional seminars to cost \$5000 each and an inter-American seminar at estimated cost of \$20,000.

US SUPPORTED (Later reading of the English text suggests that US could more properly have abstained on the ground that this is outside the field of housing.)

Resolution XXVIII - Recommended civic action and cooperation to promote regional and urban planning; also constitutional provisions on "the social function to be accomplished by private property directed to common welfare."

US SUPPORTED, it being assumed that Amendment 14 and the preamble to U. S. Constitution are consistent with the latter recommendation.

Resolution XXIX - Recommended that future meetings of this nature be at the level of Specialized Conferences with an advisory committee to serve as liaison with PAU and that seven governments be appointed to an interim committee to draft such an organization. US SUPPORTED (inasmuch as the plan closely followed US position.)

Resolution XXX - Recommended that official and semi-official agencies for housing and planning receive necessary support. US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXXI - Recommended that non-profit housing and planning agencies receive adequate support and be given privilege of attending seminars and international meetings. US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXXII - Recommended that the special committee for study of proposed Inter-American Finance Institution be charged by IA-ECOSOC with giving "explicit consideration . . ." to finance of housing, community facilities, and connected programs "as a contribution to economic development."  
US SUPPORTED - (U.S. had suggested informally during the drafting that the phrase "take into account . . ." be used but the committee used a Spanish phrase which was translated as giving "explicit consideration . . ." This does not commit U. S. in any way but merely asks that the committee give consideration to this subject as it studies the total problem of finance.)

Resolution XXXIII - Asks IA-ECOSOC to refer to the IA Planning Society a question of word usage: "planeamiento" vs "planificacion."  
US ABSTAINED (without notice being taken. English usage is not involved).

Resolution XXXIV - Recommends more collaboration with International Labor Organization. US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXXV - Recommends that the agenda for the next meeting be entrusted to the advisory body suggested to be created in connection with Specialized Conferences. US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXXVI - Recommended that the site of the next meeting be in Chile in second half of 1961 and that in the meantime there be a seminar on the importance of housing in economic development to be in Argentina in last quarter of 1960 at an estimated cost of \$20,000. US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXXVII - Vote of appreciation to Peru and the chairman of the meeting.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXXVIII - Vote of appreciation to Mayor of Lima for use of Municipal Palace for inaugural meeting.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution XXXIX - Vote of congratulation to organizing committee.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution XL - Resolution of applause to press and radio.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution XLI - Vote of appreciation to Secretary General of meeting.  
US SUPPORTED

Resolution XLII - Vote of thanks to governments, nongovernmental agencies and all persons who contributed to success of meeting.  
US SUPPORTED

## 8. FUTURE MEETINGS

Resolution XXIX recommended to IA-ECOSOC that future meetings be at the level of Specialized Conferences with an ad hoc committee to be appointed within six months composed of technical delegates designated by seven governments that represent different regions of the continent to prepare a draft organization plan and to act provisionally as advisory body on programs in the housing field.

Resolution XXXVI recommended that the third technical meeting be held in last half of 1961 in Chile and that it be preceded in last quarter of 1960 by a seminar in Argentina concerning the role of housing in economic development. (It seemed to be the thought that the observations of the seminar might provide much of the material for the consideration of the next technical meeting.)

## 9. CONCLUSIONS

### A. Recommendations regarding:

- (1) Implementation of agreements reached.

U. S. should work closely with the Secretariat of PAU in formulating the plan for the proposed Specialized Conference. Influence should be exerted continuously on the members of the ad hoc committee to assure a workable arrangement.

Department of State should consult with the Housing and Home Finance Agency concerning the various financial proposals that may grow out of the consideration of the Inter-American Financing Institution to assure that any

undertaking in this direction will include suitable financial criteria as for example: a) The proposed Fund should make no direct investment in mortgages or housing projects. b) The Fund should utilize its resources to sponsor or establish domestic private institutions in borrowing countries which would become permanent means whereby savings could be mobilized for investment in mortgages or directly in housing. c) Each investment of the Fund must be in keeping with institutions, laws, and practices of the borrowing country. d) Loans or advances in this field would usually be made to governmental institutions which in turn would be required to use them for promoting domestic financial institutions (preferably private). e) Debt service on such advances of the Fund would be governed by availability of necessary means. f) Foreign currency needs, if any, would be given special consideration. g) To qualify, a country must have reasonably stable prices.

(2) Nature and Scope of United States participation in future conferences of this type.

U. S. substantive agencies should be represented in all future meetings and play an important part in technical committees directed toward treatment of particular subjects concerning housing and urban planning.

If the future meetings go far afield into national and regional economic planning, U. S. should exert pressure to limit the scope of conferences and refuse to participate in committees which deal primarily with economic planning rather than with physical planning. Obviously the inter-relationship is close but a housing and planning conference should restrict its primary consideration to the physical aspects of planning of which the economic plays an advisory role rather than to move boldly into national or even regional economic planning in which the physical aspects are completely subordinate to a national or regional economic plan. If the latter is to be done, physical planners are not the people to do so.

B. Appraisal of work and accomplishments of the conference from the point of view of U. S. interests.

U. S. attained its position on the two most important items on which it was instructed, namely, the form future conferences are to take and the suggestion the meeting made concerning the future operations of the proposed Inter-American Institution for Development. On the less important

matter of the statement of the principles of housing, it did not obtain concurrence with U. S. position and the resulting resolution may not be fully consistent with U. S. housing policy as set forth in the Housing Act of 1949. USDEL sought informally to turn the meeting into an exchange of information rather than a forum for the passage of resolutions but such an undertaking will take much time and persuasion of the other delegations. The fact that a seminar will precede the next technical meeting indicates that other delegations are sympathetic with the effort to provide for a better exchange of ideas and information.

**Attachments:-**

1. Interview of the Honorable Mr. Walker Mason  
- questioned by the Voice of the Americas.
2. Clippings from Newspapers.
3. Documents of Conference.

**List of Informational Documents Provided by US DELEGATION:**

1. Vision Panoramica de la Vivienda  
de los Estados Unidos - Resumen.
2. Current Status of Education for Professional City  
Planners in the United States - Report presented by the  
United States Delegation.
3. Research in Building Materials and Methods in the  
United States.
4. Urban Renewal Problems, Policies and Programs.
5. Informe sobre los problemas, politicos y Planes de  
Renovacion Urbana en los Estados Unidos. Resumen.
6. Education and Civic Action in Urban and Regional Planning  
in the United States and Canada.
7. Le Educacion y la Accion Civica en la Planificacion Urbana y  
Regional de los Estados Unidos y del Canada - Resumen.
8. Estudio de materiales de construccion en los Estados Unidos.
9. Housing Finance in the United States.