consider an alternative arrangement which would have a similar impact. I attach a copy of his oral statement.

The Americans proved difficult. They argued that they had already examined the proposal with immense care and had consulted numerous lawyers. Their conclusion was that insuperable constitutional problems prevented them from subsidising interest on official credit. I subsequently spoke to a member of the US delegation to draw his attention to the fact that the Chancellor had now put forward an alternative route which did not appear to involve the sort of problems which the Americans had described as insuperable. He was not encouraging. But I suspect that the Americans have not really addressed their minds to this alternative and indeed have a general antipathy to the whole concept of reducing the debt service burden by tackling directly the size of interest payments. I also suspect that they do not draw a clear distinction between commercial bank debt (which is no direct business of Governments and where none of us wants to subsidise interest) and official debt (which is a direct concern of Governments).

We received very valuable and strong support from the Canadians during the course of the meeting. The Canadian Minister of

/Finance



Finance said that a way forward simply had to be found. I suggested to him that the Toronto Summit provided a valuable opportunity for achieving this. I said that with his leadership and our advocacy we might yet win through. I subsequently suggested to one of his officials that they might in parallel with us seek to impress upon the Americans a constructive approach to the alternative proposal put forward by the Chancellor.

Subject to any views from Geoffrey Littler and Rodric Braithwaite to whom I am copying this letter I would have thought that we ought to build this into the preparations for the Toronto Summit. Besides we may find that the Canadians will be raising it at your Sherpa meetings.

John Caines

cc Sir Geoffrey Littler
Mr Braithwaite

CHANCELLOR'S SPEAKING NOTE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 1988

AT THESE MEETINGS A YEAR AGO, I
PROPOSED AN INITIATIVE TO TACKLE THE
PROBLEMS OF THE POOREST MOST DEBT-DISTRESSED
COUNTRIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

THERE IS NOW GENERAL AGREEMENT THAT THE PROBLEMS OF THESE COUNTRIES ARE DIFFERENT IN KIND AND IN SCALE FROM THOSE OF THE MIDDLE-INCOME DEBTORS, AND DEMAND SPECIAL ATTENTION.

SINCE LAST SPRING, A GOOD DEAL HAS BEEN ACHIEVED.

BOTH THE IMF AND THE WORLD BANK HAVE RESPONDED BY PUTTING FORWARD THEIR OWN PROPOSALS.

THE IMF HAS INTRODUCED ITS
ENHANCED STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT
FACILITY. CONTRIBUTIONS ARE NOW
NOT FAR SHORT OF THE MANAGING
DIRECTOR'S TARGET OF
SDR 6 BILLION. ON THE CRITICAL ELEMENT
OF THE INTEREST SUBSIDY, WE HAVE
PLEDGED THE LARGEST SINGLE
CONTRIBUTION, SUFFICIENT TO SUBSIDISE
ONE-SIXTH OF THE MANAGING DIRECTOR'S
TARGET. I HOPE THAT OTHERS WILL
PLEDGE CONTRIBUTIONS AS SOON AS
POSSIBLE.

THE WORLD BANK IS NOW TAKING
FORWARD ITS SPECIAL PROGRAMME OF
ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA
OVER THE NEXT THREE YEARS. THIS
HAS ATTRACTED \$6.4 BILLION FOR
COUNTRIES WHICH ARE FOLLOWING
AGREED ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMMES IN
ASSOCIATION WITH THE WORLD BANK.
THE UK ALREADY SUPPORTS SUCH
PROGRAMMES AND WILL BE
CONTRIBUTING NOT FAR SHORT OF \$1/2
BILLION OVER THE NEXT THREE YEARS.

BUT THESE WELCOME DEVELOPMENTS WILL NOT BE SUFFICIENT BY THEMSELVES. THE CASE FOR THE THREE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS I MADE LAST SPRING IS AS STRONG AS EVER.

THERE HAS BEEN SOME USEFUL PROGRESS ON
THE FIRST OF THESE: CONVERTING AID LOANS
INTO GRANTS. THE UK ALONE HAS WRITTEN OFF
GETTING ON FOR \$1/2 BILLION OF AFRICAN AID
LOANS SINCE 1979. MANY OTHER DAC COUNTRIES
HAVE DONE THE SAME. I HOPE THAT THOSE THE RESERVED SAME
COUNTRIES WHICH HAVE NOT YET CONVERTED THE RESERVED.

MY SECOND PROPOSAL WAS TO RESCHEDULE
OFFICIAL DEBT OWED TO EXPORT CREDIT AGENCIES
OVER MUCH LONGER PERIODS, TO GIVE THE
DEBTORS A REAL BREATHING SPACE. I AM GLAD
TO SEE THAT, UNDER SKILFUL CHAIRMANSHIP, THE
PARIS CLUB HAS NOW AGREED TO GIVE LONGER
GRACE AND REPAYMENT PERIODS TO EIGHT DEBTOR
COUNTRIES IN AFRICA.

MY THIRD PROPOSAL WAS TO REDUCE
INTEREST RATES ON OFFICIAL DEBT. THERE HAS
BEEN PROGRESS HERE TOO. A NUMBER OF
CREDITOR COUNTRIES HAVE ACCEPTED THIS
PROPOSAL AND I WAS PARTICULARLY ENCOURAGED
BY THE ENDORSEMENT GIVEN TO IT BY THE
COMMONWEALTH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT AT
VANCOUVER.

SOME CREDITOR COUNTRIES, HOWEVER, STILL FIND IT DIFFICULT TO AGREE. I SUGGEST THAT THOSE WHO FIND ABSOLUTELY COMPELLING REASONS FOR NON-PARTICIPATION IN AN EXPLICIT INTEREST RELIEF SHOULD INITIALLY PROVIDE EQUIVALENT HELP BY RECYCLING SOME OF THE MORATORIUM INTEREST IN THE FORM OF ADDITIONAL AID GRANTS OR CONCESSIONAL LOANS. BUT THESE WOULD HAVE TO BE GENUINELY

ADDITIONAL, AND SEEN TO BE SO, AND THERE MIGHT BE A ROLE FOR THE IFI'S IN ENSURING THAT THIS IS SO.

HOWEVER WE DEAL WITH THIS, THE CASE
FOR RELIEF IS PAINFULLY SIMPLE. ALL OF US
KNOW THAT THERE IS NO WAY IN WHICH THE
POOREST COUNTRIES CAN MEET THEIR INTEREST
PAYMENTS. WITHOUT SOME RELIEF, THEIR
PROBLEMS CAN ONLY BE COMPOUNDED. UNPAID
INTEREST HAS TO BE CAPITALISED AND ROLLED
FORWARD, ATTRACTING YET MORE INTEREST ON THE
RESCHEDULED DEBT. THE INTEREST BURDEN THUS
MOUNTS EXPONENTIALLY AND AND THE POOREST
COUNTRIES ARE THUS CAUGHT IN A VICIOUS
CIRCLE.

IT IS FRANKLY UNREALISTIC TO IMAGINE THAT THEIR DEBTS WILL EVER BE SERVICED AND

REPAID IN FULL AT MARKET RATES OF INTEREST.
THE CHOICE IS BETWEEN GIVING SOME RELIEF
NOW, IN AN ORDERLY WAY, OR WAITING UNTIL THE
SITUATION BECOMES VERY MUCH WORSE.

WHAT IS IMPORTANT IS THAT, IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER, ALL CREDITOR COUNTRIES JOIN IN GIVING RELIEF FROM THE PRESENT INTEREST BURDEN. I HOPE THE PARIS CLUB WILL WORK OUT THE DETAILS SO THAT WE CAN FIND AN ACCEPTABLE SOLUTION BY THE TIME OF THE ANNUAL MEETINGS IN BERLIN THIS AUTUMN.

EVEN IF WE SUCCEED, SOME AFRICAN
COUNTRIES, PARTICULARLY SUDAN AND ZAMBIA,
HAVE ARREARS TO THE FUND WHICH ARE SO HEAVY
THAT THEY HAVE NO HOPE OF PAYING THEM OFF
FROM THEIR OWN RESOURCES. UNDER PRESENT
RULES, THIS EFFECTIVELY CUTS THEM OFF FROM

FURTHER SUPPORT FROM THE INTERNATIONAL
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS. THIS IS A SERIOUS
PROBLEM FOR THE COUNTRIES CONCERNED AND THE
IMF ALIKE. I BELIEVE WE NEED SPECIAL
MEASURES TO BREAK THE IMPASSE. THE
OBJECTIVE SHOULD BE TO MOVE, OVER TIME, TO A
POSITION WHERE ARREARS TO THE FUND CAN BE
CLEARED, WITH HELP FROM OTHER SOURCES OF
FINANCE.

I THEREFORE PROPOSE THAT THE COUNTRIES
CONCERNED SHOULD, WITH THE HELP OF THE FUND,
DEVISE AND IMPLEMENT STRONG SHADOW
PROGRAMMES. ONCE THESE HAVE RUN
SUCCESSFULLY FOR, SAY, AT LEAST A YEAR, BUT
NOT BEFORE, THE COUNTRIES SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE
FOR DRAWINGS ON THE ESAF, BACKDATED SO AS TO
GIVE CREDIT FOR PERFORMANCE UNDER THE SHADOW
PROGRAMMES. IN OTHER WORDS, IF THE

COUNTRIES CONCERNED PUT THE RIGHT POLICIES
IN PLACE, AND SHOW THEY CAN STICK TO THEM
OVER A SUFFICIENT PERIOD OF TIME, THEN IMF
WOULD THEN RESPOND WITH CONCESSIONAL
FINANCE.

REF TO

ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF DIRECT INVESTMENT
FOR ALL DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. THIS DOES NOT
ADD TO THE DEBT BURDEN. IT OFTEN PROVIDES A
WELCOME INJECTION NOT ONLY OF FINANCE BUT
ALSO OF TECHNOLOGICAL AND EXPORT TRADING
EXPERTISE. DIRECT OVERSEAS INVESTMENT FROM
BRITAIN HAS INCREASED SIGNIFICANTLY IN
RECENT YEARS. IN FACT, OVER THE MOST RECENT
THREE-YEAR PERIOD FOR WHICH FIGURES ARE
AVAILABLE, THE VALUE OF BRITAIN'S DIRECT
PRIVATE INVESTMENT TO THE DEVELOPING
COUNTRIES, AT OVER \$2 BILLION A YEAR, HAS

EXCEEDED THAT FROM ALL OTHER EUROPEAN

COUNTRIES PUT TOGETHER. REGRETTABLY, A

NUMBER OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES STILL SEE

FOREIGN INVESTMENT AS A THREAT TO THEIR

SOVEREIGNTY. ALL COUNTRIES SHOULD WELCOME

AND ENCOURAGE THE PRIVATE SECTOR'S POTENTIAL

CONTRIBUTION TO GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT.