

CONFIDENTIAL

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA

Summary Record of Proceedings DOCUMENT  
(Tuesday 15 September 1964)

Morning Session

The Chairman opened the meeting and asked the Rapporteur to present the new version of the Resolution incorporating the amendments suggested by various delegations (Annex I).

The Rapporteur explained that the wording of the new draft Resolution was substantially the same as that of the previous one and that, in addition to the amendments that were proposed he had to take into account the general feeling of the participants.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that a paragraph by paragraph approach should be followed for the adoption of the draft Resolution.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE introduced an amendment to thank the Japanese Government for its hospitality, the Chairman and the staff of ECA.

The delegate for MALI explained that his delegation was never consulted for the drafting of paragraph 3 of the first draft resolution. He asked the delegates to explain why the need for prior consultation by ECA with the Mali Government had been inserted and why it had subsequently been dropped.

The delegate for SENEGAL approving the procedure suggested by ETHIOPIA, concerning the preamble of the draft Resolution, suggested that it should read "first Conference of African Monetary Authorities" and that in the French text the word "parmi" should be replaced by "entre". He added that his main objection was the reference in paragraph 2) to the Resolution of the Organization for African Unity. While he had no doubts as to the value and importance of the resolution, he did not think it was relevant for the meeting at this stage. Resolution 95 (VI) adopted in Addis Ababa in February 1964 avoided, in fact, all reference to the previous resolution by the Heads of African States.

The Rapporteur pointed out to the delegate for SENEGAL that this point had not been included in the draft amendment submitted by him.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA pointed out that the delegate for SENEGAL had the right to express his reservations and the Rapporteur should merely take note of this.

The delegate for the MALAGASY REPUBLIC thought that the Resolution of the African Heads of State was fundamental. It would be excessive to strike it out and he would certainly not vote for this.

The delegate for SENEGAL complimented the Rapporteur for his work but reminded that SENEGAL had amended point 2 and could not vote for the resolution unless this amendment was carried.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC said that under no circumstances could he accept the deletion of the reference to the Resolution of the African Heads of State. The Senegalese suggestion was insulting and he asked his colleague from SENEGAL to withdraw.

The delegate for ALGERIA also expressed the view that it was impossible to delete from the resolution the mention of the decision of the African Heads of State but he would be prepared to put Resolution 95(VI) before the resolution of the African Heads of State.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC opposed this; the Heads of State must come first.

The delegates for TANGANYIKA and CONGO (LEOPOLDVILLE) associated themselves with the suggestion of the delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC.

The delegate for MALAGASY REPUBLIC suggested that a compromise point could be found by inserting in paragraph 2 only the mention of Resolution 95(VI).

The delegate for NIGERIA said he had already compromised with SENEGAL and it was now Senegal's turn to compromise.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE proposed that the draft be adopted in the form suggested by NIGERIA.

The delegate for SENEGAL, while declaring himself sensible to the various efforts at compromise, felt obliged to reserve his position on the text of paragraph 2.

The delegate for UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC confirmed that the Senegalese amendment was not acceptable.

The delegate for CONGO (LEOPOLDVILLE) requested SENEGAL to explain the reasons for its position.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that the second sentence of the Preamble should be left out as no agreement could be found and that discussion should move on to the operative part of the Resolution by taking each paragraph separately.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE reiterated his request that an amendment be included to thank the Japanese Government, the IMF, the Chairman, the staff of ECA and the Rapporteur.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that this should be covered in separate resolutions.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE accepted.

Paragraph 1 was approved by the participants and the Chairman passed on to paragraph 2.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that the word "other" be struck out from the second sentence of paragraph 2.

The delegate for ALGERIA requested that "suggests" should replace "encourages" in the first sentence and "association" should replace "assistance" in the second sentence.

The delegate for LIBYA preferred "requests" to "suggests".

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC moved that the second sentence should read: "may also avail themselves" instead of "should also avail themselves" and that reference should be made to "UN Specialized Agencies" rather than to "international monetary authorities" so as to cover the United Nations Council for Trade and Development.

The delegate for NIGERIA supported the Libyan amendment as ECA knew well how and where to seek assistance: it would be preferable to delete the sentence altogether.

The delegate for SENEGAL underlined that his amendment had not been taken into consideration by the Rapporteur. SENEGAL and IVORY COAST did not want the scope of ECA studies to be extended beyond Resolution 95(VI). Otherwise they would vote against the resolution.

The delegate for ALGERIA insisted that all the studies underway should be pursued and insisted on modifying the word "assistance".

The delegate for UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC reiterated his opposition to the Senegalese amendment.

The delegate for MALI proposed that the relevant part of the first sentence of paragraph 2 should say only that "ECA should.... pursue further the studies called for".

The delegate for NIGERIA underlined that the proposal put forward by MALI did not make any sense, at least in the English text.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA proposed the following version: "pursue the studies referred to above".

The delegate for LIBYA felt that time was being wasted; in view of the disagreements expressed the Resolution could not be too precise. It appeared in any way that a second meeting of African Monetary Authorities would be necessary.

The delegate for TANGANYIKA felt that the mention of both resolutions in paragraph 2 was essential and proposed deletion of the second sentence of the same paragraph.

The delegate for BURUNDI agreed with the delegate for TANGANYIKA. Why should ECA be burdened with consultations as if it were not able to do the job by itself?

The delegate for MAURITANIA suggested that the controversial point should read: "studies underway".

The Chairman agreed with the proposal.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA felt that the second sentence should stay in and mention should be made of the need for assistance by specialized agencies of the UN.

The delegate for SENEGAL reiterated that IVORY COAST and SENEGAL would refuse to accept anything but the reference to Resolution 95(VI).

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE stressed that the danger was that ECA did not consult member countries or distribute the relevant documents in time. There was a feeling among delegates that the documentation submitted was not ample enough and good enough. Without disputing the wisdom of ECA, he thought that a consultation was necessary.

The delegate for SUDAN suggested that the first sentence of paragraph 2 should read: "requests the Secretariat .... in consultation with the appropriate commissions .... to pursue further the studies now in progress".

The delegate for ETHIOPIA endorsed the suggestion of the Sudanese delegate.

The delegate for SUDAN clarified that his drafting suggestion for paragraph 2 was the following: "requests the Secretariat of ECA, in conjunction with the appropriate commissions of the OAU and in consultation with the relevant national, regional and international organizations, to pursue further the studies now in progress".

The delegate for SENEGAL expressed opposition on behalf of his delegation and that of IVORY COAST.

The Chairman, took note of the persistent opposition of SENEGAL, but questioned its right to represent IVORY COAST.

The delegate for MALI pointed out that there should be no doubts about the position of IVORY COAST as it represented the seven countries of the West African Monetary Union as well as the five countries of the Equatorial Union.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA remarked that his impression was that the delegate for IVORY COAST was not of the same opinion as the delegate for SENEGAL. (In the meantime a member of the IVORY COAST delegation took his seat).

The delegate for IVORY COAST stated his agreement with SENEGAL.

The delegate for NIGERIA regretted that SENEGAL and IVORY COAST did not associate themselves with the resolution which was acceptable to the other members. Several compromises had already been reached on the agenda to please the two delegations. Now their opposition only concentrated on the reference to the resolution of the African Heads of State and he could not see how SENEGAL and IVORY COAST could insist on dropping a resolution approved by their Heads of State. A formula like "studies now in progress" should not be objectionable.

The delegate for MALI expressed the wish that a text of resolution be found which would gather unanimous approval: it would be disagreeable to show the world that African delegates had differences and joined NIGERIA to request SENEGAL and IVORY COAST to be careful and to try and reach a compromise.

In answer to this, the delegate for SENEGAL insisted that paragraph 2 should only mention Resolution 95(VI).

The delegates for MALI and MALAGASY REPUBLIC asked the delegations to state their reasons of opposition to the amendment introduced by SENEGAL and IVORY COAST.

The delegate for NIGERIA, on his part, felt that both resolutions were relevant and that there was no reason to limit the studies to be pursued by ECA; he requested SENEGAL to explain its position.

The delegate for SENEGAL explained that his opposition was based on methodological reasons. The resolution by the African Heads of State was wider than Resolution 95(VI). Although working in execution of the OAU resolution, ECA should be given a mandate to go into specific matters.

The delegate for NIGERIA insisted that if only Resolution 95(VI) was mentioned this would imply setting a limit to the resolution of OAU.

The delegate for UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC thought that the purpose of SENEGAL was to slow down the activity of ECA and seemed to convey the idea that the decision of the Heads of State had been premature. All this was not acceptable.

The Chairman proposed that the delegates should move on to paragraph 3 and then adjourn to seek a compromise on paragraph 2.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that the second sentence should read: "this meeting of experts ...".

The delegate for SENEGAL endorsed the suggestion of ETHIOPIA but insisted that the meeting should be convened by the Government of Mali.

The delegate for ALGERIA pointed out that the appointment of Mali could be justified within the framework of the IMF but had no relevance for an ECA meeting. He felt that both the meeting of experts and the conference of African Monetary Authorities should be convened by ECA.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE thought that the resolution was vague as to a time-table. He underlined that the documents submitted by ECA had reached him in London on his way to Kuala Lumpur. It was necessary that sufficient time should be allowed to the delegates, but did not consider Mali could convene the meeting.

The delegate for MALI thanked all delegations for the explanations that had been provided and agreed that the meeting should not be convened by MALI. He did not agree, however, that the meeting should be called by ECA. He had already deplored at the first session the procedure followed by ECA in convening the present meeting. ECA was only a Secretariat and should be in permanent consultation with the Economic Commission of the OAU. The initiative for a meeting should come from a political institution such as the OAU.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that the meeting of experts should be convened by the Executive Secretary of ECA and the Executive Secretary of the Organization of African Unity jointly.

The delegate for SENEGAL suggested that the meeting should be called by the delegate for ALGERIA in his capacity as Chairman of the present meeting.

The delegate for MALI stressed that he did not wish that the conference should be called by the Executive Secretary of ECA.

The Chairman suggested that the meeting should be called by the Secretary of OAU.

The Deputy Executive Secretary of ECA said that any formal resolutions should be logical. The organization which was charged with convening any conference would have to undertake all the administrative and technical responsibility connected with it. ECA had excellent relations with OAU with which it cooperated closely. No doubt another conference could be convened, if delegates so desired, either by ECA or OAU but the responsibility could not be divided.

The delegate for CONGO (LEOPOLDVILLE) suggested that ECA should take the initiative, but that a political organ such as OAU should actually convene it.

The Deputy Executive Secretary said that this proposal might cause budgetary or administrative difficulties.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE said that ECA was quite capable of convening the meeting which was its legitimate function.

The delegate for MALI stressed that he had never said that ECA would not be capable and, in fact, had shown itself on various occasions to be pursuing very actively African integration. The calling of the meeting by OAU should not render the task of ECA too difficult.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC moved that the proposed by MALI be adopted.

The delegate for SENEGAL associated himself with the proposal.

The delegate for SUDAN felt that so long as this first meeting had been entrusted to ECA and the work had been done by it, it should also call the next conference of experts.

The delegate of ALGERIA felt that ECA was in a better position to take care of practical and organizational aspects of the conference. He suggested that the next meeting should be organized by the Executive Secretary of ECA but convened by the Executive Secretary of OAU.

At this point the Deputy Executive Secretary of ECA pointed out that this was not possible as a financial problem was involved and the organization which called the conference would also have to pay for the expenses involved.

The delegate for MALI inferred that ECA was not entirely willing to collaborate.

The Rapporteur called the attention of the delegates to the fact that the whole discussion was about a meeting of experts appointed by their respective governments at the request of ECA.

The delegate for NIGERIA stressed that the organization that convened the meeting would have to make all the material arrangements for the meeting itself.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC enquired whether it would be useful if the President of the African Development Bank were to convene the meeting.



The delegate for NIGERIA suggested that the real necessity was to have a new meeting. He was not sure that OAU was ready to organize it and therefore supported the view that ECA should be responsible.

The delegate for MALI suggested that the meeting be called by ECA but with the agreement of the Secretary-General of the OAU.

The Deputy Executive Secretary stated that ECA saw no objections to this proposal.

The delegate for ALGERIA enquired whether it would be appropriate to invite African governments in exile to participate in the conference.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA said this suggestion should be recorded.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE was still worried about ensuring that studies were completed in accordance with a given time-table and a documentation made available to Governments in sufficient time.

The delegate for SENEGAL reiterated his opposition to the motion as drafted.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC supported the delegate for SIERRA LEONE but suggested that the point regarding the time-table should be dealt with through the medium of the Summary Record.

The delegate for MALI said the resolution as now amended was acceptable to him but SENEGAL was still obdurate; in fact, even if the Senegalese desired to restrict paragraph 2 to the studies envisaged by Resolution 95(VI) it would not check the dynamism of ECA.

The delegate for the MALAGASY REPUBLIC saw no reason why the Senegalese request could not be accepted.

The delegate for NIGERIA, as a last attempt at compromise, suggested that the Preamble should be revised to read: "inspired by the resolution adopted in Addis Ababa in May 1963 by the Heads of African State and taking into account Resolution 95(VI) of the Sixth Session of the Economic Commission for Africa....", and if this was accepted by SENEGAL he was prepared to add an exclusive reference to Resolution 95(VI) at the end of paragraph 2. He further suggested that the delegates for NIGERIA and SENEGAL should get together and draft this compromise text.

- - - - -

Afternoon Session

At the beginning of the session, the Chairman distributed the third compromise draft of the Resolution and suggested that it should be discussed paragraph by paragraph as already done in the morning session. He added that although there was some hope that unanimous approval could be reached on this compromise draft, dissenting voices had already reached the chair, especially on the wording of paragraph 2. Following the procedure adopted by the Chairman, the meeting unanimously approved the preamble and paragraph 1.

On paragraph 2, the delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC stressed that Resolution 95(VI) limited the work of ECA in relation with the much broader terms of reference given by the Resolution of the African Heads of State. If further activity of ECA were to be restricted only to Resolution 95(VI), this would imply a step backward.

The delegate for ALGERIA expressed his agreement with the delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC. The delegate for SENEGAL stated that the opposition of the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC and ALGERIA was contrary to the compromise understanding that appeared to have been reached in the morning. His delegation considered that the work of ECA had not yet been completed and consequently further studies were in order within the terms of reference indicated in Resolution 95(VI). If any change were to be made to the draft Resolution to broaden the scope for ECA activity, the delegations of IVORY COAST and SENEGAL would vote against the Resolution.

The delegate for the MALAGASY REPUBLIC appealed to the wisdom of the participants and said that it seemed that some of the delegates were going back on what they appeared to have accepted.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA emphasized that the point had already been discussed on several occasions and that a show down appeared to be necessary. In his view, there could be a majority in favour of the Resolution in its final draft and dissenting members could have their position shown in the record.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE felt that the Ethiopian proposition should have been made in the morning session when unanimous agreement was reached, except for the opposition of the two delegations from IVORY COAST and SENEGAL. In a way he felt sorry that this had not happened as coming back in the afternoon seemed to have changed the position considerably. He added that African delegations were putting themselves to shame in the face of the whole world.

The Chairman requested the participants to suggest a way in which the difficulty should be overcome, whether by a vote or by further attempts at compromise.

The delegate for SENEGAL expressed his doubts that the delegations of IVORY COAST and SENEGAL were alone in their position. After all a compromise Resolution had been drafted jointly by NIGERIA and SENEGAL and this compromise Resolution was before the meeting for approval. He felt that this final draft should be voted upon.

The delegate for NIGERIA expressed his opposition to voting. It was necessary to find "a common ground of understanding".

The delegate for ETHIOPIA felt that he had been misunderstood. It was not necessary of course to come to a vote but only try and feel the majority consensus of the meeting. Discussion could not go on indefinitely. He asked the delegate for SENEGAL to explain his position more clearly.

The delegate for ALGERIA suggested that the draft Resolution as discussed in the morning should be the basis for discussion and should be approved with the only opposition of SENEGAL and IVORY COAST.

The delegate for the MALAGASY REPUBLIC expressed his feeling that the differences between the delegations were only of a formal nature and suggested that the majority of the participants accept the last version of the resolution on which certain delegations could express their reservations if so desired. If the final draft was carried by the majority, then delegations opposed to it could have their opposition entered in the records.

The delegate for NIGERIA expressed the view that in the face of persisting differences there should only be a report indicating that some

---

delegations were in favour of putting no limit on the future activity of ECA while others were against it.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC stressed that in African meetings there had never been a vote. A vote on this occasion would be a bad precedent. Unless a unanimous decision could be reached, the only way out was to fall back on the summary record of the meeting.

The delegate for NIGERIA suggested that the meeting should be adjourned for a few minutes in a last effort at reaching a compromise that would satisfy all delegations.

The Chairman suspended the meeting for 15 minutes and upon resumption of the meeting the delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC asked the representatives of ECA to tell him whether ECA would in any way be limited in the implementation of the Resolution of the Heads of African State if the Resolution was carried in the text proposed by SENEGAL. He further inquired whether summary records could be circulated to the delegates the following day, for approval by them.

The Deputy Executive Secretary of ECA clarified that all ECA work was done in agreement with the directives set out by OAU and Resolution 95(VI) was in fact nothing but the execution of the Resolution adopted by the African Heads of State.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC said that he had understood, therefore, that the text of paragraph 2 of the Resolution would in no way delay or limit the execution of the Resolution approved by the African Heads of State. This being the case, he would request ECA's statement to be recorded in the summary records and saw no further objections to accepting the draft Resolution.

The delegate for ALGERIA pointed out that he had compromised to a very large extent in order to seek unanimity, but now all efforts for a compromise seemed to have failed with the unpleasant result of breaking down the positions as were evident in the morning session during which full agreement existed on a text of a resolution with the only oppositions of SENEGAL and IVORY COAST. The Algerian delegation could not therefore vote for the last version of the resolution and had to go back to its former proposals, namely: (i) the calling of an African Conference on Trade to deal

with such matters as exchange problems, transportation, communications, and other obstacles to intra-African trade; (ii) the convening of a meeting of African financial authorities and (iii) the furthering of the studies undertaken by ECA without any limits whatsoever. Any resolution that would not include these three points would not be satisfactory to the Algerian delegation. The differences that were being voiced in the morning were not merely differences of form; they referred to the very substance of the work to be done by ECA in response to the directives indicated in the resolution of the African Heads of State. Unfortunately the documents prepared by ECA for the meeting were not complete and were not distributed on time to allow all delegations to receive instructions from their respective governments. A new meeting of African financial authorities was, therefore, necessary to study the documents already prepared by ECA and the additional studies that ECA would have to prepare.

The delegate for SENEGAL reiterated his feeling that a compromise had been reached and begged, therefore, his dissenting colleagues to reconsider their position.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC wished to clarify that in reaching the compromise he had not yielded to SENEGAL but to the objective of African unity.

The delegate for ALGERIA indicated that unanimity being now impossible, some other solution should be found; or else a new meeting of African Monetary Authorities would have to be convened to discuss again the whole matter.

The delegate for NIGERIA felt that there was still a possibility for agreement as the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC had accepted the last draft resolution and the only dissenting voice was now that of ALGERIA. He requested the delegate for ALGERIA to indicate what formulation of paragraph 2 would be acceptable to him.

The delegate for ALGERIA said that the value of the resolution had progressively been reduced. He felt accordingly that it would be necessary to go back to the draft resolution as formulated at the beginning of the morning session ("to pursue further the studies now in progress").

The delegate for SENEGAL did not see the advantage of going back on what appeared to be a compromise formula.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE said he could not quite understand the opposition of certain delegations who were objecting to the draft resolution although they had been on the Drafting Committee.

The delegate for LIBYA found no objection to the suggestion put forward by ALGERIA. If the wording "studies now in progress" was acceptable then the resolution could be carried.

The delegate for SENEGAL pointed out that the text had already been submitted in the morning and that he had already stated his opposition to it.

The ETHIOPIAN delegate felt the situation was now clear. The suggestion put forward by ALGERIA had general approval but could not be accepted by IVORY COAST and SENEGAL. Another solution would be to have paragraph 2 read: "requests, as a first step, the Secretariat....". Would this be acceptable to SENEGAL and IVORY COAST?

The LIBYAN delegate seeing that ALGERIA wanted paragraph 2 to say "studies now in progress" and the delegate for SENEGAL wanted a specific reference to Resolution 95(VI), suggested that the two might be combined to satisfy everybody.

The delegate for MALI clarified what the text would read in French on the basis of the LIBYAN proposal.

The delegate for SENEGAL felt that under the circumstances he preferred not to have a resolution at all as this suggestion was ambiguous.

ALGERIA went back on its position that any effort at compromise was useless and it would be preferable to fall back on a summary record.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC suggested that the matter be referred to the Ministers' meeting in Lagos for the African Development Bank.

The delegate for NIGERIA suggested that the Chairman should feel the reaction of participants to the proposals put forward by the MALI and LIBYAN delegations as he sensed a certain consensus of opinion on it. He was not, however, asking for a vote. He felt that a compromise solution might have been found and wanted to hear the reactions to it.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA felt this was only waste of time as the delegation for SENEGAL had already voiced its opposition to this proposal. He added that a Summary Record should be prepared as this was acceptable to all participants.

The delegate for MAURITANIA indicated that a vote was not possible.

The Chairman requested the Secretariat to prepare a Summary Record and distribute it to the delegates through the mail.

The Rapporteur indicated that the press had insistently requested a statement by the Chairman and therefore some sort of concerted press declaration would have to be issued.

The Chairman suggested, as a last attempt at compromise, that paragraph 2 of the resolution should be deleted altogether.

The delegate for SENEGAL accepted this proposal if paragraph 3 were to be modified to exclude all reference to the studies indicated in paragraph 2.

The delegate for the MALAGASY REPUBLIC voiced his satisfaction that the meeting should at last have found a compromise resolution.

The delegate for NIGERIA said that the resolution without paragraph 2 would be meaningless as paragraph 2 was the only important one.

The delegate for ALGERIA was concerned by the statement to be issued to the press and suggested that the press be informed that a new meeting of African Monetary Authorities would be held to discuss the ECA report some time in the future.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA insisted that the Summary Record should be the main concern, the statement to the press being a matter of secondary importance.

The Chairman repeated that the Secretariat was not in a position to circulate the Summary Records to the participants before their departure. They would have to be mailed to the delegations in their respective countries. He felt that the debates, although they had not led to any resolution, had not been useless. The lively debate at the meeting was proof of the interest the delegations had shown in the subjects under discussion.

He was sure, furthermore, to interpret the feeling of the participants in extending his warmest thanks to the Government of Japan for their hospitality, as well as to the IMF, the IBRD and the ECA Secretariat. These thanks could be embodied in two resolutions to be formally presented by a participating delegate.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA then proposed the text of the two resolutions, as follows:

"Thanks the Government and the people of Japan for the excellent preparation which has been made and the hospitality so generously extended to the participants."

"1. Thanks the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Monetary Fund, for the assistance given to prepare the meeting,

"2. Expresses its gratitude to the staff members of the International Monetary Fund for their assistance and participation during the meeting."

The resolutions were approved unanimously and applauded by the delegates.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC insisted on having the Summary Records before his departure on Thursday.

The Deputy Executive Secretary wished to join ECA in the warmest thanks to the Japanese Government, to the International Monetary Fund and to the IBRD. He also stated, on behalf of Mr. Gardiner and the Secretariat, his warmest thanks to the participants.

The Chairman asked the participants whether they wished to agree on a text of a press communiqué.

The delegate for SENEGAL suggested that this should be left to the Secretariat and to the Chairman, it being understood that such a communiqué was not official and every delegation would inform the press of its views in its respective country.

The Chairman then terminated the First Meeting of African Monetary Authorities.



Report by the Rapporteur

September 15, 1964

(REVISED DRAFT RESOLUTION)

The Conference of African Monetary Authorities meeting in Tokyo between the 12th and 15th of September 1964 with the object of promoting general monetary cooperation among African countries, Taking into account the Resolution of the African Heads of State meeting in Addis Ababa in May 1963 and of the 6th Session of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (Resolution 95(VI))

1. Thanks the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa for convening the Conference of African Monetary Authorities and for the General Report presented to it;
2. Encourages the Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Africa, in conjunction with the appropriate Commissions of the Organization of African Unity, to pursue further the studies called for by these resolutions. The Secretariat should also avail themselves of the assistance of other international monetary authorities.
3. Recommends the convening of a meeting of experts nominated by Member Governments to consider the results of these studies, and to make recommendations thereon to the Conference of African Monetary Authorities meeting, if possible, in Washington on the occasion of the next joint annual meeting of IMF and IBRD. This meeting should be convened by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa.

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA  
First Meeting of African Monetary Authorities  
Tokyo, 12-15 September 1964

RESOLUTION

The Conference of African Monetary Authorities meeting in Tokyo between the 12th and 15th of September 1964 with the object of promoting general monetary cooperation among African countries,

INSPIRED BY the Resolution of the African Heads of State meeting in Addis Ababa in May 1963 and

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT Resolution 95(VI) of the 6th Session of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa

1. THANKS the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa for convening the Conference of African Monetary Authorities and for the General Report presented to it;
2. REQUESTS the Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Africa, in conjunction with the appropriate Commissions of the Organization of African Unity and in consultation with the relevant national, regional and international organizations to pursue further the studies called for by Resolution 95(VI) adopted by the Economic Commission for Africa in Addis Ababa in February 1964.
3. RECOMMENDS the convening of a meeting of experts nominated by Member Governments to consider the results of these studies, and to make recommendations thereon to the Conference of African Monetary Authorities meeting, if possible, in Washington on the occasion of the next joint annual meeting of IMF and IBRD. The meeting of experts should be convened by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa, with the agreement of the Secretary-General of the Organization for African Unity.

CONFIDENTIAL

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA

Summary Record of Proceedings  
(Tuesday 15 September 1964)

Morning Session

The Chairman opened the meeting and asked the Rapporteur to present the new version of the Resolution incorporating the amendments suggested by various delegations (Annex I).

The Rapporteur explained that the wording of the new draft Resolution was substantially the same as that of the previous one and that, in addition to the amendments that were proposed he had to take into account the general feeling of the participants.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that a paragraph by paragraph approach should be followed for the adoption of the draft Resolution.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE introduced an amendment to thank the Japanese Government for its hospitality, the Chairman and the staff of ECA.

The delegate for MALI explained that his delegation was never consulted for the drafting of paragraph 3 of the first draft resolution. He asked the delegates to explain why the need for prior consultation by ECA with the Mali Government had been inserted and why it had subsequently been dropped.

The delegate for SENEGAL approving the procedure suggested by ETHIOPIA, concerning the preamble of the draft Resolution, suggested that it should read "first Conference of African Monetary Authorities" and that in the French text the word "parmi" should be replaced by "entre". He added that his main objection was the reference in paragraph 2) to the Resolution of the Organization for African Unity. While he had no doubts as to the value and importance of the resolution, he did not think it was relevant for the meeting at this stage. Resolution 95 (VI) adopted in Addis Ababa in February 1964 avoided, in fact, all reference to the previous resolution by the Heads of African States.

The Rapporteur pointed out to the delegate for SENEGAL that this point had not been included in the draft amendment submitted by him.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA pointed out that the delegate for SENEGAL had the right to express his reservations and the Rapporteur should merely take note of this.

The delegate for the MALAGASY REPUBLIC thought that the Resolution of the African Heads of State was fundamental. It would be excessive to strike it out and he would certainly not vote for this.

The delegate for SENEGAL complimented the Rapporteur for his work but reminded that SENEGAL had amended point 2 and could not vote for the resolution unless this amendment was carried.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC said that under no circumstances could he accept the deletion of the reference to the Resolution of the African Heads of State. The Senegalese suggestion was insulting and he asked his colleague from SENEGAL to withdraw.

The delegate for ALGERIA also expressed the view that it was impossible to delete from the resolution the mention of the decision of the African Heads of State but he would be prepared to put Resolution 95(VI) before the resolution of the African Heads of State.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC opposed this; the Heads of State must come first.

The delegates for TANGANYIKA and CONGO (LEOPOLDVILLE) associated themselves with the suggestion of the delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC.

The delegate for MALAGASY REPUBLIC suggested that a compromise point could be found by inserting in paragraph 2 only the mention of Resolution 95(VI).

The delegate for NIGERIA said he had already compromised with SENEGAL and it was now Senegal's turn to compromise.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE proposed that the draft be adopted in the form suggested by NIGERIA.

The delegate for SENEGAL, while declaring himself sensible to the various efforts at compromise, felt obliged to reserve his position on the text of paragraph 2.

The delegate for UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC confirmed that the Senegalese amendment was not acceptable.

The delegate for CONGO (LEOPOLDVILLE) requested SENEGAL to explain the reasons for its position.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that the second sentence of the Preamble should be left out as no agreement could be found and that discussion should move on to the operative part of the Resolution by taking each paragraph separately.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE reiterated his request that an amendment be included to thank the Japanese Government, the IMF, the Chairman, the staff of ECA and the Rapporteur.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that this should be covered in separate resolutions.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE accepted.

Paragraph 1 was approved by the participants and the Chairman passed on to paragraph 2.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that the word "other" be struck out from the second sentence of paragraph 2.

The delegate for ALGERIA requested that "suggests" should replace "encourages" in the first sentence and "association" should replace "assistance" in the second sentence.

The delegate for LIBYA preferred "requests" to "suggests".

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC moved that the second sentence should read: "may also avail themselves" instead of "should also avail themselves" and that reference should be made to "UN Specialized Agencies" rather than to "international monetary authorities" so as to cover the United Nations Council for Trade and Development.

The delegate for NIGERIA supported the Libyan amendment as ECA knew well how and where to seek assistance: it would be preferable to delete the sentence altogether.

The delegate for SENEGAL underlined that his amendment had not been taken into consideration by the Rapporteur. SENEGAL and IVORY COAST did not want the scope of ECA studies to be extended beyond Resolution 95(VI). Otherwise they would vote against the resolution.

The delegate for ALGERIA insisted that all the studies underway should be pursued and insisted on modifying the word "assistance".

---

The delegate for UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC reiterated his opposition to the Senegalese amendment.

The delegate for MALI proposed that the relevant part of the first sentence of paragraph 2 should say only that "ECA should.... pursue further the studies called for".

The delegate for NIGERIA underlined that the proposal put forward by MALI did not make any sense, at least in the English text.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA proposed the following version: "pursue the studies referred to above".

The delegate for LIBYA felt that time was being wasted; in view of the disagreements expressed the Resolution could not be too precise. It appeared in any way that a second meeting of African Monetary Authorities would be necessary.

The delegate for TANGANYIKA felt that the mention of both resolutions in paragraph 2 was essential and proposed deletion of the second sentence of the same paragraph.

The delegate for BURUNDI agreed with the delegate for TANGANYIKA. Why should ECA be burdened with consultations as if it were not able to do the job by itself?

The delegate for MAURITANIA suggested that the controversial point should read: "studies underway".

The Chairman agreed with the proposal.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA felt that the second sentence should stay in and mention should be made of the need for assistance by specialized agencies of the UN.

The delegate for SENEGAL reiterated that IVORY COAST and SENEGAL would refuse to accept anything but the reference to Resolution 95(VI).

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE stressed that the danger was that ECA did not consult member countries or distribute the relevant documents in time. There was a feeling among delegates that the documentation submitted was not ample enough and good enough. Without disputing the wisdom of ECA, he thought that a consultation was necessary.

The delegate for SUDAN suggested that the first sentence of paragraph 2 should read: "requests the Secretariat .... in consultation with the appropriate commissions .... to pursue further the studies now in progress".

The delegate for ETHIOPIA endorsed the suggestion of the Sudanese delegate.

The delegate for SUDAN clarified that his drafting suggestion for paragraph 2 was the following: "requests the Secretariat of ECA, in conjunction with the appropriate commissions of the OAU and in consultation with the relevant national, regional and international organizations, to pursue further the studies now in progress".

The delegate for SENEGAL expressed opposition on behalf of his delegation and that of IVORY COAST.

The Chairman, took note of the persistent opposition of SENEGAL, but questioned its right to represent IVORY COAST.

The delegate for MALI pointed out that there should be no doubts about the position of IVORY COAST as it represented the seven countries of the West African Monetary Union as well as the five countries of the Equatorial Union.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA remarked that his impression was that the delegate for IVORY COAST was not of the same opinion as the delegate for SENEGAL. (In the meantime a member of the IVORY COAST delegation took his seat).

The delegate for IVORY COAST stated his agreement with SENEGAL.

The delegate for NIGERIA regretted that SENEGAL and IVORY COAST did not associate themselves with the resolution which was acceptable to the other members. Several compromises had already been reached on the agenda to please the two delegations. Now their opposition only concentrated on the reference to the resolution of the African Heads of State and he could not see how SENEGAL and IVORY COAST could insist on dropping a resolution approved by their Heads of State. A formula like "studies now in progress" should not be objectionable.

The delegate for MALI expressed the wish that a text of resolution be found which would gather unanimous approval: it would be disagreeable to show the world that African delegates had differences and joined NIGERIA to request SENEGAL and IVORY COAST to be careful and to try and reach a compromise.

In answer to this, the delegate for SENEGAL insisted that paragraph 2 should only mention Resolution 95(VI).

The delegates for MALI and MALAGASY REPUBLIC asked the delegations to state their reasons of opposition to the amendment introduced by SENEGAL and IVORY COAST.

The delegate for NIGERIA, on his part, felt that both resolutions were relevant and that there was no reason to limit the studies to be pursued by ECA; he requested SENEGAL to explain its position.

The delegate for SENEGAL explained that his opposition was based on methodological reasons. The resolution by the African Heads of State was wider than Resolution 95(VI). Although working in execution of the OAU resolution, ECA should be given a mandate to go into specific matters.

The delegate for NIGERIA insisted that if only Resolution 95(VI) was mentioned this would imply setting a limit to the resolution of OAU.

The delegate for UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC thought that the purpose of SENEGAL was to slow down the activity of ECA and seemed to convey the idea that the decision of the Heads of State had been premature. All this was not acceptable.

The Chairman proposed that the delegates should move on to paragraph 3 and then adjourn to seek a compromise on paragraph 2.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that the second sentence should read: "this meeting of experts ....".

The delegate for SENEGAL endorsed the suggestion of ETHIOPIA but insisted that the meeting should be convened by the Government of Mali.

The delegate for ALGERIA pointed out that the appointment of Mali could be justified within the framework of the IMF but had no relevance for an ECA meeting. He felt that both the meeting of experts and the conference of African Monetary Authorities should be convened by ECA.



The delegate for SIERRA LEONE thought that the resolution was vague as to a time-table. He underlined that the documents submitted by ECA had reached him in London on his way to Kuala Lumpur. It was necessary that sufficient time should be allowed to the delegates, but did not consider Mali could convene the meeting.

The delegate for MALI thanked all delegations for the explanations that had been provided and agreed that the meeting should not be convened by MALI. He did not agree, however, that the meeting should be called by ECA. He had already deplored at the first session the procedure followed by ECA in convening the present meeting. ECA was only a Secretariat and should be in permanent consultation with the Economic Commission of the OAU. The initiative for a meeting should come from a political institution such as the OAU.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA suggested that the meeting of experts should be convened by the Executive Secretary of ECA and the Executive Secretary of the Organization of African Unity jointly.

The delegate for SENEGAL suggested that the meeting should be called by the delegate for ALGERIA in his capacity as Chairman of the present meeting.

The delegate for MALI stressed that he did not wish that the conference should be called by the Executive Secretary of ECA.

The Chairman suggested that the meeting should be called by the Secretary of OAU.

The Deputy Executive Secretary of ECA said that any formal resolutions should be logical. The organization which was charged with convening any conference would have to undertake all the administrative and technical responsibility connected with it. ECA had excellent relations with OAU with which it cooperated closely. No doubt another conference could be convened, if delegates so desired, either by ECA or OAU but the responsibility could not be divided.

The delegate for CONGO (LEOPOLDVILLE) suggested that ECA should take the initiative, but that a political organ such as OAU should actually convene it.

The Deputy Executive Secretary said that this proposal might cause budgetary or administrative difficulties.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE said that ECA was quite capable of convening the meeting which was its legitimate function.

The delegate for MALI stressed that he had never said that ECA would not be capable and, in fact, had shown itself on various occasions to be pursuing very actively African integration. The calling of the meeting by OAU should not render the task of ECA too difficult.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC moved that the proposed by MALI be adopted.

The delegate for SENEGAL associated himself with the proposal.

The delegate for SUDAN felt that so long as this first meeting had been entrusted to ECA and the work had been done by it, it should also call the next conference of experts.

The delegate of ALGERIA felt that ECA was in a better position to take care of practical and organizational aspects of the conference. He suggested that the next meeting should be organized by the Executive Secretary of ECA but convened by the Executive Secretary of OAU.

At this point the Deputy Executive Secretary of ECA pointed out that this was not possible as a financial problem was involved and the organization which called the conference would also have to pay for the expenses involved.

The delegate for MALI inferred that ECA was not entirely willing to collaborate.

The Rapporteur called the attention of the delegates to the fact that the whole discussion was about a meeting of experts appointed by their respective governments at the request of ECA.

The delegate for NIGERIA stressed that the organization that convened the meeting would have to make all the material arrangements for the meeting itself.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC enquired whether it would be useful if the President of the African Development Bank were to convene the meeting.

---

The delegate for NIGERIA suggested that the real necessity was to have a new meeting. He was not sure that OAU was ready to organize it and therefore supported the view that ECA should be responsible.

The delegate for MALI suggested that the meeting be called by ECA but with the agreement of the Secretary-General of the OAU.

The Deputy Executive Secretary stated that ECA saw no objections to this proposal.

The delegate for ALGERIA enquired whether it would be appropriate to invite African governments in exile to participate in the conference.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA said this suggestion should be recorded.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE was still worried about ensuring that studies were completed in accordance with a given time-table and a documentation made available to Governments in sufficient time.

The delegate for SENEGAL reiterated his opposition to the motion as drafted.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC supported the delegate for SIERRA LEONE but suggested that the point regarding the time-table should be dealt with through the medium of the Summary Record.

The delegate for MALI said the resolution as now amended was acceptable to him but SENEGAL was still obdurate; in fact, even if the Senegalese desired to restrict paragraph 2 to the studies envisaged by Resolution 95(VI) it would not check the dynamism of ECA.

The delegate for the MALAGASY REPUBLIC saw no reason why the Senegalese request could not be accepted.

The delegate for NIGERIA, as a last attempt at compromise, suggested that the Preamble should be revised to read: "inspired by the resolution adopted in Addis Ababa in May 1963 by the Heads of African State and taking into account Resolution 95(VI) of the Sixth Session of the Economic Commission for Africa....", and if this was accepted by SENEGAL he was prepared to add an exclusive reference to Resolution 95(VI) at the end of paragraph 2. He further suggested that the delegates for NIGERIA and SENEGAL should get together and draft this compromise text.

### Afternoon Session

At the beginning of the session, the Chairman distributed the third compromise draft of the Resolution and suggested that it should be discussed paragraph by paragraph as already done in the morning session. He added that although there was some hope that unanimous approval could be reached on this compromise draft, dissenting voices had already reached the chair, especially on the wording of paragraph 2. Following the procedure adopted by the Chairman, the meeting unanimously approved the preamble and paragraph 1.

On paragraph 2, the delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC stressed that Resolution 95(VI) limited the work of ECA in relation with the much broader terms of reference given by the Resolution of the African Heads of State. If further activity of ECA were to be restricted only to Resolution 95(VI), this would imply a step backward.

The delegate for ALGERIA expressed his agreement with the delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC. The delegate for SENEGAL stated that the opposition of the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC and ALGERIA was contrary to the compromise understanding that appeared to have been reached in the morning. His delegation considered that the work of ECA had not yet been completed and consequently further studies were in order within the terms of reference indicated in Resolution 95(VI). If any change were to be made to the draft Resolution to broaden the scope for ECA activity, the delegations of IVORY COAST and SENEGAL would vote against the Resolution.

The delegate for the MALAGASY REPUBLIC appealed to the wisdom of the participants and said that it seemed that some of the delegates were going back on what they appeared to have accepted.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA emphasized that the point had already been discussed on several occasions and that a show down appeared to be necessary. In his view, there could be a majority in favour of the Resolution in its final draft and dissenting members could have their position shown in the record.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE felt that the Ethiopian proposition should have been made in the morning session when unanimous agreement was reached, except for the opposition of the two delegations from IVORY COAST and SENEGAL. In a way he felt sorry that this had not happened as coming back in the afternoon seemed to have changed the position considerably. He added that African delegations were putting themselves to shame in the face of the whole world.

The Chairman requested the participants to suggest a way in which the difficulty should be overcome, whether by a vote or by further attempts at compromise.

The delegate for SENEGAL expressed his doubts that the delegations of IVORY COAST and SENEGAL were alone in their position. After all a compromise Resolution had been drafted jointly by NIGERIA and SENEGAL and this compromise Resolution was before the meeting for approval. He felt that this final draft should be voted upon.

The delegate for NIGERIA expressed his opposition to voting. It was necessary to find "a common ground of understanding".

The delegate for ETHIOPIA felt that he had been misunderstood. It was not necessary of course to come to a vote but only try and feel the majority consensus of the meeting. Discussion could not go on indefinitely. He asked the delegate for SENEGAL to explain his position more clearly.

The delegate for ALGERIA suggested that the draft Resolution as discussed in the morning should be the basis for discussion and should be approved with the only opposition of SENEGAL and IVORY COAST.

The delegate for the MALAGASY REPUBLIC expressed his feeling that the differences between the delegations were only of a formal nature and suggested that the majority of the participants accept the last version of the resolution on which certain delegations could express their reservations if so desired. If the final draft was carried by the majority, then delegations opposed to it could have their opposition entered in the records.

The delegate for NIGERIA expressed the view that in the face of persisting differences there should only be a report indicating that some

---

delegations were in favour of putting no limit on the future activity of ECA while others were against it.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC stressed that in African meetings there had never been a vote. A vote on this occasion would be a bad precedent. Unless a unanimous decision could be reached, the only way out was to fall back on the summary record of the meeting.

The delegate for NIGERIA suggested that the meeting should be adjourned for a few minutes in a last effort at reaching a compromise that would satisfy all delegations.

The Chairman suspended the meeting for 15 minutes and upon resumption of the meeting the delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC asked the representatives of ECA to tell him whether ECA would in any way be limited in the implementation of the Resolution of the Heads of African State if the Resolution was carried in the text proposed by SENEGAL. He further inquired whether summary records could be circulated to the delegates the following day, for approval by them.

The Deputy Executive Secretary of ECA clarified that all ECA work was done in agreement with the directives set out by OAU and Resolution 95(VI) was in fact nothing but the execution of the Resolution adopted by the African Heads of State.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC said that he had understood, therefore, that the text of paragraph 2 of the Resolution would in no way delay or limit the execution of the Resolution approved by the African Heads of State. This being the case, he would request ECA's statement to be recorded in the summary records and saw no further objections to accepting the draft Resolution.

The delegate for ALGERIA pointed out that he had compromised to a very large extent in order to seek unanimity, but now all efforts for a compromise seemed to have failed with the unpleasant result of breaking down the positions as were evident in the morning session during which full agreement existed on a text of a resolution with the only oppositions of SENEGAL and IVORY COAST. The Algerian delegation could not therefore vote for the last version of the resolution and had to go back to its former proposals, namely: (i) the calling of an African Conference on Trade to deal

---

with such matters as exchange problems, transportation, communications, and other obstacles to intra-African trade; (ii) the convening of a meeting of African financial authorities and (iii) the furthering of the studies undertaken by ECA without any limits whatsoever. Any resolution that would not include these three points would not be satisfactory to the Algerian delegation. The differences that were being voiced in the morning were not merely differences of form; they referred to the very substance of the work to be done by ECA in response to the directives indicated in the resolution of the African Heads of State. Unfortunately the documents prepared by ECA for the meeting were not complete and were not distributed on time to allow all delegations to receive instructions from their respective governments. A new meeting of African financial authorities was, therefore, necessary to study the documents already prepared by ECA and the additional studies that ECA would have to prepare.

The delegate for SENEGAL reiterated his feeling that a compromise had been reached and begged, therefore, his dissenting colleagues to reconsider their position.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC wished to clarify that in reaching the compromise he had not yielded to SENEGAL but to the objective of African unity.

The delegate for ALGERIA indicated that unanimity being now impossible, some other solution should be found; or else a new meeting of African Monetary Authorities would have to be convened to discuss again the whole matter.

The delegate for NIGERIA felt that there was still a possibility for agreement as the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC had accepted the last draft resolution and the only dissenting voice was now that of ALGERIA. He requested the delegate for ALGERIA to indicate what formulation of paragraph 2 would be acceptable to him.

The delegate for ALGERIA said that the value of the resolution had progressively been reduced. He felt accordingly that it would be necessary to go back to the draft resolution as formulated at the beginning of the morning session ("to pursue further the studies now in progress").

The delegate for SENEGAL did not see the advantage of going back on what appeared to be a compromise formula.

The delegate for SIERRA LEONE said he could not quite understand the opposition of certain delegations who were objecting to the draft resolution although they had been on the Drafting Committee.

The delegate for LIBYA found no objection to the suggestion put forward by ALGERIA. If the wording "studies now in progress" was acceptable then the resolution could be carried.

The delegate for SENEGAL pointed out that the text had already been submitted in the morning and that he had already stated his opposition to it.

The ETHIOPIAN delegate felt the situation was now clear. The suggestion put forward by ALGERIA had general approval but could not be accepted by IVORY COAST and SENEGAL. Another solution would be to have paragraph 2 read: "requests, as a first step, the Secretariat....". Would this be acceptable to SENEGAL and IVORY COAST?

The LIBYAN delegate seeing that ALGERIA wanted paragraph 2 to say "studies now in progress" and the delegate for SENEGAL wanted a specific reference to Resolution 95(VI), suggested that the two might be combined to satisfy everybody.

The delegate for MALI clarified what the text would read in French on the basis of the LIBYAN proposal.

The delegate for SENEGAL felt that under the circumstances he preferred not to have a resolution at all as this suggestion was ambiguous.

ALGERIA went back on its position that any effort at compromise was useless and it would be preferable to fall back on a summary record.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC suggested that the matter be referred to the Ministers' meeting in Lagos for the African Development Bank.

The delegate for NIGERIA suggested that the Chairman should feel the reaction of participants to the proposals put forward by the MALI and LIBYAN delegations as he sensed a certain consensus of opinion on it. He was not, however, asking for a vote. He felt that a compromise solution might have been found and wanted to hear the reactions to it.



The delegate for ETHIOPIA felt this was only waste of time as the delegation for SENEGAL had already voiced its opposition to this proposal. He added that a Summary Record should be prepared as this was acceptable to all participants.

The delegate for MAURITANIA indicated that a vote was not possible.

The Chairman requested the Secretariat to prepare a Summary Record and distribute it to the delegates through the mail.

The Rapporteur indicated that the press had insistently requested a statement by the Chairman and therefore some sort of concerted press declaration would have to be issued.

The Chairman suggested, as a last attempt at compromise, that paragraph 2 of the resolution should be deleted altogether.

The delegate for SENEGAL accepted this proposal if paragraph 3 were to be modified to exclude all reference to the studies indicated in paragraph 2.

The delegate for the MALAGASY REPUBLIC voiced his satisfaction that the meeting should at last have found a compromise resolution.

The delegate for NIGERIA said that the resolution without paragraph 2 would be meaningless as paragraph 2 was the only important one.

The delegate for ALGERIA was concerned by the statement to be issued to the press and suggested that the press be informed that a new meeting of African Monetary Authorities would be held to discuss the ECA report some time in the future.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA insisted that the Summary Record should be the main concern, the statement to the press being a matter of secondary importance.

The Chairman repeated that the Secretariat was not in a position to circulate the Summary Records to the participants before their departure. They would have to be mailed to the delegations in their respective countries. He felt that the debates, although they had not led to any resolution, had not been useless. The lively debate at the meeting was proof of the interest the delegations had shown in the subjects under discussion.

He was sure, furthermore, to interpret the feeling of the participants in extending his warmest thanks to the Government of Japan for their hospitality, as well as to the IMF, the IBRD and the ECA Secretariat. These thanks could be embodied in two resolutions to be formally presented by a participating delegate.

The delegate for ETHIOPIA then proposed the text of the two resolutions, as follows:

"Thanks the Government and the people of Japan for the excellent preparation which has been made and the hospitality so generously extended to the participants."

"1. Thanks the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Monetary Fund, for the assistance given to prepare the meeting,

"2. Expresses its gratitude to the staff members of the International Monetary Fund for their assistance and participation during the meeting."

The resolutions were approved unanimously and applauded by the delegates.

The delegate for the UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC insisted on having the Summary Records before his departure on Thursday.

The Deputy Executive Secretary wished to join ECA in the warmest thanks to the Japanese Government, to the International Monetary Fund and to the IBRD. He also stated, on behalf of Mr. Gardiner and the Secretariat, his warmest thanks to the participants.

The Chairman asked the participants whether they wished to agree on a text of a press communiqué.

The delegate for SENEGAL suggested that this should be left to the Secretariat and to the Chairman, it being understood that such a communiqué was not official and every delegation would inform the press of its views in its respective country.

The Chairman then terminated the First Meeting of African Monetary Authorities.

Report by the Rapporteur

September 15, 1964

(REVISED DRAFT RESOLUTION)

The Conference of African Monetary Authorities meeting in Tokyo between the 12th and 15th of September 1964 with the object of promoting general monetary cooperation among African countries, Taking into account the Resolution of the African Heads of State meeting in Addis Ababa in May 1963 and of the 6th Session of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (Resolution 95(VI))

1. Thanks the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa for convening the Conference of African Monetary Authorities and for the General Report presented to it;
2. Encourages the Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Africa, in conjunction with the appropriate Commissions of the Organization of African Unity, to pursue further the studies called for by these resolutions. The Secretariat should also avail themselves of the assistance of other international monetary authorities.
3. Recommends the convening of a meeting of experts nominated by Member Governments to consider the results of these studies, and to make recommendations thereon to the Conference of African Monetary Authorities meeting, if possible, in Washington on the occasion of the next joint annual meeting of IMF and IBRD. This Meeting should be convened by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa.

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR AFRICA  
First Meeting of African Monetary Authorities  
Tokyo, 12-15 September 1964

RESOLUTION

The Conference of African Monetary Authorities meeting in Tokyo between the 12th and 15th of September 1964 with the object of promoting general monetary cooperation among African countries,

INSPIRED BY the Resolution of the African Heads of State meeting in Addis Ababa in May 1963 and

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT Resolution 95(VI) of the 6th Session of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa

1. THANKS the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa for convening the Conference of African Monetary Authorities and for the General Report presented to it;
2. REQUESTS the Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Africa, in conjunction with the appropriate Commissions of the Organization of African Unity and in consultation with the relevant national, regional and international organizations to pursue further the studies called for by Resolution 95(VI) adopted by the Economic Commission for Africa in Addis Ababa in February 1964.
3. RECOMMENDS the convening of a meeting of experts nominated by Member Governments to consider the results of these studies, and to make recommendations thereon to the Conference of African Monetary Authorities meeting, if possible, in Washington on the occasion of the next joint annual meeting of IMF and IBRD. The meeting of experts should be convened by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa, with the agreement of the Secretary-General of the Organization for African Unity.