

(Mr. Berlin, Canada)

His delegation would have been able to accept the text of article 26 but for the manner in which most-favoured-nation treatment was referred to; a basis for international trade relations should be worked out between the States themselves.

With regard to article 28, his delegation considered that techniques to protect the terms of trade of developing countries deserved detailed examination, but doubted the feasibility of linking the prices of their exports to the prices of their imports. It was premature to include such a concept in the Charter.

In general his delegation was disappointed that it had not been possible to reach agreement on a Charter enjoying the general support of the international community. In view of the manner in which the Charter had been adopted, it could not be considered as a basis for the evolution of international law in the controversial areas where it had not achieved general acceptance.

Mr. SKOGLUND (Sweden) said that his delegation had voted for the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, which he regarded as an expression of support for the principles of intergovernmental economic relations within the framework of a new international economic order. Nevertheless, it should have been possible with a further effort and in a spirit of compromise on all sides to reach a consensus; he hoped that efforts in that direction would continue. With a few exceptions, he had supported all the articles in the Charter; in a few cases he had abstained and only on one paragraph - article 2, paragraph 2 (c), on the settlement of disputes in case of nationalization - had he cast a negative vote.

His Government fully supported paragraphs 1, 2 (a) and 2 (b) of article 2. But as regards paragraph 2 (c) his Government, while recognizing the sovereign right of States to nationalize foreign property, still held the view, which was in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1803 (XVII), that international disputes following nationalization should be settled by an international court.

His Government accepted the principle that primary commodity producers could associate in organizations and that by so doing they might assist the growth of world economy; but that did not necessarily imply that his Government supported all the measures which might be taken by associations of the kind referred to in article 5, and it reserved the right to protect its legitimate interests in that context.