



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resumed Fifty-first Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

Friday, 29 October 1971,  
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 5

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (E/5012 (part I), E/5033 and Add.1-4, E/5038, E/5072, E/5079, E/L.1467)

1. Mr. DJERMAKOYE (Under-Secretary-General for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories), introducing the Secretary-General's report (E/5033 and Add.1-4) which had been prepared pursuant to paragraph 14 (a) of General Assembly resolution 2704 (XXV) of 14 December 1970, said that replies from the specialized agencies and international organizations concerned had been organized under the four headings listed in paragraph 3 of document E/5033. The report had been transmitted to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) at its tenth session and to the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and should therefore be read in conjunction with the report of CPC on the first part of its tenth session (E/5072) and the resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 21 October 1971.<sup>1</sup>

2. He also read out paragraph 12 of the report of the Secretary-General, prepared pursuant to paragraph 14 (b) of General Assembly resolution 2704 (XXV),<sup>2</sup> which drew the particular attention of the executive heads of the various organizations to paragraph 11 of the latter resolution.

3. Mr. THIAM (Organization of African Unity) said that his Organization looked forward to increased co-operation with the United Nations for the benefit of the national liberation movements. The many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council recognizing the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence and condemning colonialism and racial discrimination gave moral support to the people of Africa. The Organization of African Unity was pleased that contacts had been established with a number of specialized agencies with a view to formulating concrete programmes of assistance to the national liberation movements. The International Monetary Fund (IMF), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organi-

zation (UNESCO) were already providing such assistance. It was to be hoped that the preliminary contacts made with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) would be followed up by action as soon as possible. The need for food in the liberated areas was most acute, particularly in Guinea (Bissau). Assistance in the form of clothing, educational facilities and reconstruction for development was also urgently needed.

4. He hoped that discussions under way in the Fourth Committee with a view to enabling the true representatives of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Namibia to speak on behalf of their populations in the United Nations would yield positive results.

5. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that the provision of more substantial support by the specialized agencies to colonial peoples and Territories, especially in southern Africa, was a question of great importance not only to the Council but also to those United Nations organs responsible for colonial questions. His delegation appreciated the increased aid provided by a number of organizations in the United Nations system, in close co-operation with the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees and the Organization of African Unity, to refugees from colonial Territories in southern Africa. Interagency co-operation had been greatly strengthened over the past years, but greater participation by UNDP and the World Bank was still required. It was regrettable that no significant progress had been made in achieving more flexibility in the procedures of most specialized agencies relating to refugee aid; the majority of them still required a separate Government request in every case.

6. Only a few of the specialized agencies had so far responded to the appeal contained in paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 2704 (XXV) for assistance to national liberation movements. The recent contacts of the Special Committee with liberation movements again showed the need for the United Nations, in conjunction with the Organization of African Unity, to take the initiative in developing specific programmes in health, education and nutrition, all of which were an essential part of the liberation struggle. His delegation therefore welcomed the recent decisions taken by UNESCO with regard to specific programmes in education, and hoped that its example would be followed by other specialized agencies.

7. His delegation was gratified to note the increased participation of OAU in multilateral consultations with the specialized agencies. It was to be hoped that as a result, and in view of the latter's declared willingness to co-operate, they would find ways and means of making a practical contribution to fulfilling the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

<sup>1</sup> A/8480, issued directly in final form (offset).

<sup>2</sup> A/AC.109/387. For the printed text, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 23*, chap. III, para. 12.

8. The draft resolution in document E/L.1467, which his delegation wished to introduce on behalf of the sponsors, was based on Economic and Social Council resolution 1534 (XLIX) of 24 July 1970, which had been adopted without objection. The main difference was that the report of the Secretary-General requested in General Assembly resolution 2704 (XXV) had now appeared as document E/5033 and Add.1-4. The draft resolution therefore took note of that and other relevant reports, and decided to transmit to the General Assembly the reports of the President of the Council (E/5079) and CPC (E/5072). His delegation hoped that the draft would win unanimous support.

9. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that as a sponsor of the draft resolution, his delegation was satisfied with the conclusions reached as a result of the discussions between the President of the Council and the Chairman of the Special Committee. It particularly welcomed the progress made, under the aegis of the High Commissioner for Refugees, in enlarging the participation of many organizations in refugee assistance programmes benefiting the colonial peoples of Africa, as well as the readiness of UNDP to consider financing educational and training projects beneficial to refugees from within the resources available for interregional projects.

10. The draft resolution took note of the report of the President of the Council and recommended action on its conclusions. It was to be hoped that the organizations of the United Nations system would give those conclusions the attention they merited, and that discussion in the Fourth Committee would reveal other possibilities for the provision of aid to refugees.

11. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the very fact that after 10 years the question of implementation of the Declaration remained on the agenda of the United Nations and the specialized agencies made it clear that the process was far from complete. CPC had felt that there was still much that the specialized agencies and their member States should do to remove difficulties, often of a constitutional nature, which continued to limit the ability of some of those agencies to comply with Economic and Social Council and General Assembly resolutions concerning decolonization. Accordingly, General Assembly resolution 2704 (XXV) had affirmed once again the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples to achieve freedom, which entailed the extension by the United Nations system of all necessary moral and material assistance to national liberation movements. The resolution had specifically called on IBRD and IMF to withhold financial, economic, technical and other assistance from the Governments of Portugal and South Africa until they renounced their policies of racial discrimination and colonial domination. Finally, it had invited the specialized agencies to examine, in consultation with OAU, the possibility of providing for participation by the leaders of liberation movements in conferences, seminars and other regional meetings.

12. Most of the specialized agencies, in particular FAO, ILO, WHO and UNESCO, had responded positively to the General Assembly's appeals. Along with ICAO, IMCO, UNICEF and UPU, they no longer provided assistance to

colonialist régimes. His delegation believed that the specialized agencies should also cease providing economic, financial, technical or any other international assistance to the Governments of those countries which were participating in aggression against the Arab countries of the Middle East or in the aggressive war against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the other peoples of Indo-China.

13. Unfortunately, a number of organizations within the United Nations system were not implementing the recommendations set forth in General Assembly resolution 2704 (XXV). IBRD and IMF had not only sabotaged the implementation of the Declaration since the moment of its adoption, but were openly encouraging South African and Portuguese colonialism. From 1968 to 1970, IMF had granted South Africa loans totalling \$226 million, while IBRD loans to Portugal had totalled \$67.5 million and to South Africa \$241.8 million. In many of the specialized agencies an excessively bureaucratic attitude was taken to questions relating to implementation of the Declaration. Action was too often confined to providing information on General Assembly decisions, and the practical aspect of their work was not affected. CPC had noted that situation, and the attention of the governing bodies of various specialized agencies had more than once been drawn to it.

14. In his report to the General Assembly,<sup>3</sup> the Secretary-General had given no clear answer to the question of whether representatives of liberation movements could attend agency conferences, seminars and meetings. In his delegation's view, there was no reason why direct participation was not possible, since representatives of those movements had already participated in meetings of the Economic Commission for Africa, and that practice could without difficulty be extended to other organizations. If there were constitutional difficulties, the constitution must be changed. The Council should therefore agree on a suitable recommendation for subsequent endorsement by the General Assembly. His delegation agreed with the suggestion in paragraph 10 of the report of the President of the Council that the Council might consider ways and means of enlisting the support of non-governmental organizations in consultative status with it in the achievement of the objectives of General Assembly resolution 2704 (XXV). The same paragraph referred to the decision of the General Conference of UNESCO—which called for an investigation of international intergovernmental organizations enjoying relations with UNESCO and which had branches, sections, affiliates or constituent parts in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia or Portuguese-dominated African Territories, with respect to the practice of racial discrimination or segregation in their policies, activities or membership or their co-operation in any way with the South African Government's policy of *apartheid*. A similar investigation of the non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Council should be conducted, and an operative paragraph to that effect should be added to the draft resolution in document E/L.1467. His delegation was prepared to consult the sponsors in an effort to arrive at a suitable text.

15. His delegation also endorsed the hope expressed in paragraph 11 of the report of the President of the Council

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

that in future information on action taken or envisaged by the various units within the United Nations itself, including those concerned with technical assistance, in implementation of the provisions of Assembly resolution 2704 (XXV), would be included in the Secretary-General's comprehensive reports.

16. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said his delegation was somewhat concerned that the preparation of a report such as that suggested by the representative of the Soviet Union might have considerable financial implications.

17. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in his delegation's view, the report could be prepared within existing allocations, since it would not be necessary to hire experts or consultants for the task.

18. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution accepted the Soviet representative's suggestion and accordingly wished to add the following new operative paragraph 3 to their text:

"3. *Instructs* its Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to study how non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Council assist in the achievement of the objectives of the Declaration and other relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, and to report to the Council at its fifty-fourth session, taking into due account the deliberations on this item at the resumed fifty-first session of the Council."

The new paragraph thus requested the Council to do as UNESCO had done. The present operative paragraph 3 would become operative paragraph 4.

19. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) requested a statement of the financial implications of the new paragraph. Additional meetings of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations would probably be required, thus entailing further expenditure. He also wished to know whether the new paragraph had been prompted by suggestions that certain non-governmental organizations were not complying with the provisions of the Declaration.

20. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that, despite the fact that the item under consideration called specifically for information from the international institutions associated with the United Nations, virtually no such information had been received. In proposing the new operative paragraph, the sponsors of the draft resolution and his own delegation had been prompted by weighty considerations similar to those which had led UNESCO to investigate the activities of international intergovernmental organizations enjoying relations with it with respect to their compliance with the Declaration and other United Nations resolutions. He could not share the United Kingdom representative's misgivings concerning possible financial implications. The Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations would have time to prepare the report called for between the Council's fifty-second and fifty-fourth sessions. The Secretariat should not fail to draw the attention of that Committee to the fact that it should take into account the debate on the item at the current session of the Council. Lastly, the Secretariat should not always automatically assume that any proposal advanced would have financial implications.

21. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) drew the United Kingdom representative's attention to paragraph 10 of the report of the President of the Council. The purpose of the new operative paragraph 3 was to elicit information on the ways in which non-governmental organizations aided African refugees and the national liberation movements and the extent to which they collaborated with Southern Rhodesia, Portugal and South Africa.

22. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that although he appreciated the explanations given by the Soviet and Tunisian representatives, he still had reservations concerning possible financial implications. It was the obligation of the Secretariat to state whether any proposal had financial implications, as it had done in the case of the proposal in the Second Committee to circulate the statement by the Administrator of UNDP as an official Committee document.

23. His delegation would like more time to consider the report of the President of the Council and the draft resolution. However, it would not press the matter if the Council wished to take a vote at the current meeting.

24. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) urged the Council to proceed to the vote at the current meeting in order to enable the Fourth Committee to give further consideration to the question.

25. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that he thought the Fourth Committee should receive the reports of the President of the Council and CPC as soon as possible. The Council should therefore vote on the draft resolution at the current meeting.

26. Mr. DUNN (United States of America) said that his delegation did not wish to obstruct the orderly proceedings of the Council but had difficulties in considering the draft resolution which had only been circulated during the current meeting, since the resolution called for the endorsement of conclusions and suggestions of the report of the President of the Council which had been only recently distributed and had not been considered by his Government. However, a cursory review of the report showed that there were conclusions the United States could not support. It also had reservations concerning the new operative paragraph 3 and the financial implications of that paragraph.

27. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council) said that the Fourth Committee planned to consider the item now under discussion in the Council during the week beginning 8 November. It would therefore be expedient if the Council could complete its consideration of the item in time for the relevant part of its report to be available to the Committee by that date. He had consulted with the appropriate Secretariat officials and wished to inform the Council that, at the present stage, the Secretariat did not foresee that the new operative paragraph 3 would have any financial implications. If the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations proposed action which would require expenditures beyond those in the approved budget, the Secretariat would inform the Committee to that effect and the Council would have the opportunity to review the Committee's report.

28. Mr. KASATKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Council was wasting time and money arguing about financial implications and urged it to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution.

29. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that the specialized agencies played a valuable role in facilitating the process of decolonization within their technical spheres of competence. The General Assembly should not request them to take measures which went beyond the scope of their constitutions, nor should it call upon them to amend those instruments. Those considerations had prompted his delegation to abstain in the vote on General Assembly resolution 2704 (XXV). His delegation had reservations regarding the report of the President of the Council, and its vote in favour of draft resolution E/L.1467 would not mean that it agreed that the specialized agencies should amend their constitutions in order to implement the recommendations in that report.

30. Mr. RAKOTOSIHANAKA (Madagascar) said that his delegation had reservations about the juridical aspects of certain issues raised in the report, especially those which might have a negative effect on the specialized agencies and create a dangerous precedent.

31. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote. It was unable to accept some of the suggestions in the report which might be incompatible with the specific responsibilities of the specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies under their respective statutes.

32. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would have liked time to refer the report and the draft resolution to its Government for instructions. It would therefore abstain in the vote but wished to stress that it did not interpret the draft resolution as calling upon specialized agencies to take any action outside the terms of their constitution.

33. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution (E/L.1467), as revised.

*The draft resolution, as revised, was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 6

##### World Food Programme: pledging target for 1973-1974 (E/L.1462 and Add.1)

34. The PRESIDENT recalled that at its 1799th meeting, on 30 July 1971, the Council had taken note of the ninth annual report of the Intergovernmental Committee of the World Food Programme (E/5022). At that time no firm recommendation for a pledging target had been made. The Intergovernmental Committee had now recommended a target of \$340 million, and had proposed a draft resolution for adoption by the Council, the text of which was reproduced in document E/L.1462 and Add.1.

35. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that his Government had not yet decided on the amount of its pledge to WFP in the light of the new pledging target. However, it appeared that the proposed increase over the present target figure

would cover little more than the probable rising costs for the next biennium. An amount less than \$340 million might require a reduction in WFP's over-all programme. His delegation was therefore prepared to support the draft resolution before the Council.

36. Mr. DUNN (United States of America) said his delegation supported the pledging target which had been proposed. However, it regretted that the current pledging target of \$300 million had not been fulfilled because some donors had not participated in the Programme to the extent anticipated. The multilateral character of WFP was thereby diminished, and if the current low rate of participation continued, the target of \$600 million which it was hoped to reach by the end of the Second United Nations Development Decade would be unattainable. His delegation was concerned at that situation, but would continue its support of WFP, and would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

37. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said his delegation was prepared to support the draft resolution. However, it must express a reservation with regard to the pledging target which had been set, since it had not yet received instructions from its Government.

38. Mr. VIAUD (France) said his delegation had no objection to the draft resolution. However, it felt that the proposed pledging target was somewhat unrealistic.

39. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) endorsed the comments made by the representative of France.

40. The PRESIDENT said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted the draft resolution contained in document E/L.1462 and Add.1.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 1

##### Report of the International Monetary Fund (concluded)\* (E/5075; E/L.1466)

41. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) introduced draft resolution E/L.1466 on behalf of Kenya and Tunisia, which had been joined by the delegation of Madagascar. Since the report before the Council (see E/5075) dealt only with the period up to 30 April and the Managing Director had made a statement (1800th meeting) covering events since that date, it seemed inappropriate for the Council merely to take note with appreciation of the report. In the report, IMF reiterated its warning on the danger of the slow but constant deterioration in the international monetary situation, but no solution had been achieved before the Bretton Woods system had become inoperable as a result of fluctuations in a number of European currencies and of the United States decision to suspend the convertibility of the dollar into gold.

42. The sponsors felt that the Council should express concern at the serious situation, which had resulted, but were aware that a controversial text might give rise to lengthy debate, for which there was not time at the present

\* Resumed from the 1801st meeting.

stage. The draft resolution therefore did not reflect all the concerns of the developing countries as expressed in the joint statement of those countries to the Trade and Development Board (see E/5076/Add.2, annex II). Indeed, a comprehensive resolution was not necessary, since the Second Committee would also be adopting a resolution on the subject arising out of its general debate; his delegation was, moreover, prepared to associate itself with any action recommended by the current Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77, as it had already associated itself with the views of that Group.<sup>4</sup>

43. The sponsors of the draft resolution had nevertheless felt that the Council should make a contribution to the world-wide debate on the international monetary situation, expressing concern at its effects on the economic and social progress of the developing countries, effects which seriously compromised the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy. The draft resolution referred to the report of IMF, and took note of Trade and Development Board resolution 84 (XI), which requested the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to undertake consultations with the Managing Director of IMF to ensure that the interests of developing countries were taken into account in any changes made in the international monetary system (see E/5076/Add.2, annex I).

44. Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was based on the fact that the disarray in the international monetary situation, for which the developing countries were in no way responsible, nevertheless had very serious consequences for them. Operative paragraph 2 referred to Council resolution 1627 (LI), which had unfortunately been adopted too late to prevent the crisis caused by the United States decision of 15 August. Nevertheless, that crisis could be solved if Member States and IMF acted in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of that Council resolution. IMF had in fact done so at the recent meeting of its Board of Governors, and operative paragraph 3 accordingly noted with satisfaction the resulting resolution 26.9 of the Board, which requested Member States to establish a satisfactory exchange rate structure and requested the Managing Director to study measures for improving or reforming the current system. In both cases, the sponsors believed that the requirements of the developing countries should be taken fully into account. Accordingly, operative paragraph 4 affirmed that all States members of the Fund should be given the opportunity to participate fully and from the outset in consultations and negotiations leading to international monetary reform. Finally, operative paragraph 5 reflected the overriding importance of the International Development Strategy, in the context of which the solution to the current monetary problems must be achieved.

45. Mr. DO RIO-BRANCO (Brazil) noted that the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 was currently meeting at Lima, Peru. The importance of that meeting, which would discuss, *inter alia*, the international monetary situation, was emphasized by the fact that the Second Committee had suspended its meetings for the duration of the Meeting. His delegation could not associate itself at the present stage with any resolution on the international monetary situation

which might prejudice the results of the discussions currently going on at a higher level; however, that attitude should not be interpreted as a criticism of the draft before the Council. His delegation would therefore not participate in any vote on the draft resolution.

46. Mr. SIRIWARDENE (Ceylon) said his delegation supported the draft resolution, which was intended mainly to reflect the Council's concern at the current crisis. The international monetary situation was being given high priority at meetings of IMF, in the Second Committee and at the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77, and it was therefore entirely appropriate for the Economic and Social Council to express its own views. His delegation would welcome the replacement of the word "foundation" in operative paragraph 3 by "initial basis", and the addition at the end of the paragraph of the words "which would take into account the interests of the developing countries"; if those amendments were accepted, his delegation was prepared to join in sponsoring the draft resolution.

47. Mr. MORAN (Peru) said that as a developing country which was undergoing profound social and economic changes and was in the process of asserting its sovereignty over its natural resources, Peru was seriously affected by the current crisis. However, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution before the Council because on 22 October the Group of 77 had reserved its right to submit a draft resolution on the same subject to the Second Committee after the Ministerial Meeting of the Group had had an opportunity to take stock of the crisis and the response of the developed countries to the legitimate aspirations expressed by the developing countries.

48. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation could not agree that the proceedings of an extraneous meeting could take precedence over the Economic and Social Council. The draft resolution approached the problem in the right way and in the correct sequence. The sponsors had rightly concluded that what was needed was an affirmation of the steps taken by the Council and IMF. The draft resolution was not inconsistent with discussions conducted elsewhere and it would therefore be in order for the Council to adopt it. However, his delegation had reservations regarding the amendments proposed by the Ceylonese representative, which created a certain imbalance. In the view of his delegation, the approach to the problem should be a global one, and the matter should not be considered exclusively from the viewpoint of the particular interests of developing countries. In conclusion, although his Government had been unable to support Trade and Development Board resolution 84 (XI), which was cited in the text, it would vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Council.

49. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) noted that the draft resolution sought to strengthen Council resolution 1627 (LI) and the work of IMF because the sponsors believed it imperative that the Council and the Fund, which alone had the necessary authority to tackle the problems created by the world financial crisis, should make every effort to find a solution. His delegation supported the amendments proposed by the delegation of Ceylon to operative paragraph 3.

<sup>4</sup> See A/C.2/L.1166.



50. Miss LIM (Malaysia) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution and found it difficult to believe that the very general statement of principle which it contained would be incompatible with the decisions taken at the Meeting of the Group of 77.

51. Mr. MANDERSON-JONES (Jamaica) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution and accepted the amendments proposed by Ceylon as a development of Economic and Social Council resolution 1627 (LI) which his delegation had co-sponsored. He referred to the fact that the international monetary crisis was subsequent to the adoption of resolution 1627 (LI) and that it was necessary for the resumed session of the Council to make some reference to the international monetary situation in the present circumstances. However, he sympathized with those delegations which had expressed misgivings with respect to the timing of the draft resolution in view of the current Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 in Lima. His delegation, however, while supporting the draft resolution, would not allow it to prejudice any decisions or recommendations on the international monetary situation emerging from the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 in Lima.

52. Mr. VIAUD (France) said it was natural that the Council should express its concern about the international monetary situation. Although his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote on Trade and Development Board resolution 84 (XI), it intended to support the draft resolution now under discussion. He requested clarification on the first Ceylonese amendment and said that his delegation felt that the second amendment should indicate that the interests of all Member States and in particular those of the developing countries should be taken into account.

53. Mr. KUMI (Ghana) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, which should in no way prejudice the decisions of the Meeting of the Group of 77.

54. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation fully shared the grave concern which had been expressed about the international monetary situation and in particular its negative effects on the developing countries. However, it felt that there were certain weaknesses in the draft resolution before the Council. It could not agree with operative paragraph 2, which affirmed that Economic and Social Council resolution 1627 (LI) provided a satisfactory basis for a solution. That resolution had been extremely inadequate in its description of the monetary crisis and its lack of precise recommendations. His delegation objected to operative paragraph 3; it failed to understand why resolution 26.9 of the Fund's Board of Governors should be noted with satisfaction since the recent IMF meeting was universally acknowledged to have been fruitless and disappointing. His delegation could accept the amendment proposed by Ceylon, which was designed to strengthen that paragraph. The wording of operative paragraph 4 was extremely restrictive; all developing countries, regardless of whether they were members of IMF, should be allowed to take part in consultations and negotiations leading to international monetary reforms. Operative paragraph 5 merely urged Member States to co-operate with IMF in the search for equitable solutions, whereas there should also be co-operation with UNCTAD and other

concerned United Nations bodies, and recommendations for positive action should be spelled out.

55. The draft resolution did not reflect the very thorough discussion which had taken place in the General Assembly on the international monetary situation and it was much less satisfactory than other resolutions approved by UNCTAD and the Economic Commission for Latin America. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote.

56. Mr. SIRIWARDENE (Ceylon) said that his first amendment had been designed to ensure that any appropriate action that was to be taken could be initiated without delay. He noted that his second amendment had found a considerable measure of support in the Council. He felt that there should be a specific reference to the developing countries in operative paragraph 3 since the international monetary situation had already had a serious effect on those countries and any further deterioration would have even more dangerous repercussions on their economies. He had no objection to the subamendment proposed by the French representative.

57. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that the draft resolution would not prejudice decisions taken elsewhere. As far as his delegation was concerned, the question was being dealt with at two different levels and any Council action would be quite separate from any decision taken by the General Assembly. With regard to the comments by the Soviet representative on operative paragraphs 4 and 5, he said that the sponsors had certainly not intended to impose any restrictions; they had merely felt that the International Monetary Fund was the best forum in which to find a solution to the crisis. While the resolution did not reflect the debate in the Second Committee, it reflected the debate in the Council. The sponsors were able to accept the amendments proposed by Ceylon and the subamendment proposed by France.

58. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that it was useful and timely that the Council was considering the draft resolution. His delegation had objected to Trade and Development Board resolution 84 (XI), it still opposed it, and it would have voted against the third preambular paragraph, had it been voted on separately. Also, it considered operative paragraph 1 too one-sided since economic development problems may well reflect a slowing down of economic activity in a number of developed countries and other factors unrelated to the international monetary situation. Despite those observations, the United States delegation was prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution now before the Council. However, it could not accept the second Ceylonese amendment to operative paragraph 3, and would be obliged to abstain in the vote if it was inserted. It agreed that resolution 26.9 of the Board of Governors of IMF should form the basis for an early and satisfactory solution to the present monetary crisis and that the interests of the developing countries should be taken into account; however, it felt that their situation was part of the total picture and should not be singled out in operative paragraph 3.

59. Mr. VIAUD (France) emphasized once again that any solution to the monetary crisis must be global in nature. He wished to revise his subamendment to the second Ceylonese

amendment to operative paragraph 3 to read: "... which would take into account the interests of all Member States and, in particular, those of the developing countries".

60. Mr. UTHEIM (Norway) said that his delegation could accept the Ceylonese amendments and the revised French subamendment and would vote in favour of the draft resolution, which adequately reflected the views of his Government.

61. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/L.1466 on the report of the International Monetary Fund, as amended, of which Ceylon was now a sponsor.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 16 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

62. Mr. MORAN (Peru) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote in view of the consensus adopted by the Group of 77 on 22 October 1971.

63. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that in substance his delegation agreed with the draft resolution, but had abstained in the vote so as not to prejudice his delegation's position in the Second Committee.

64. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) recalled that his delegation had already stated its views in the Second Committee. The monetary crisis stemmed from inherent contradictions in the Western economic system for which radical remedies were imperative. The resolution just adopted had not advocated specific and positive action and his delegation had therefore abstained in the vote.

65. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that while his delegation could have accepted the original text it had been unable to accept the amendments to operative paragraph 3, and had accordingly abstained.

*The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.*