Page 4 Substitute the following paragraph for the delegate of India's statement:

"The Delegate of India, Mr. Dharma Vira, stressed the importance of the issues raised. He reminded the Contracting Parties of their obligations under the GATT and the general principles of the Havana Charter, according to which judgment on essentially political matters by the GATT should be avoided. He felt that if political differences were allowed to affect commercial treaties, the binding force of international agreements would be very seriously weakened. It seemed to him, however, that if any two contracting parties had arrived at a stage where trade between them is hardly possible, then the working of the Agreement itself between them is seriously affected and, in such circumstances, it would be difficult to compel one or both parties to do something with which they entirely disagreed. Attempts at compulsion would only lead to continuous friction and would be defeating the objective aimed at. It appeared to his Government, therefore, unrealistic and impracticable to adopt a course involving compulsion in such matters. Article XXV, paragraph 5(a) of the GATT lays down a procedure by which, in exceptional circumstances, the Contracting Parties may waive obligations, with certain provisos. Though no specific circumstances permitting waiver are mentioned, the fact that the relations of two contracting parties are such that either is unable to deal with the other would appear to be an exceptional circumstance that could not be ignored from any practical point of view. Whilst the question was not free from difficulties, in the balance, his Government were of the opinion that they could not come in the way of a contracting party which was desirous of taking advantage of paragraph 5(a) of Article XXV in such special circumstances. He referred to the declaration proposed by the United States and considered that the use of the word 'suspension' rather than 'termination' was of great importance. He also noted that the declaration envisaged reciprocal action and would not affect the obligations either of the United States or Czechoslovakia in regard to other contracting parties. The proposal appeared to take a practical view of the situation between the two countries and, therefore, he was prepared to support it. He, however, wished to make it clear that, in supporting the proposal, his Delegation was not taking sides on the system of economic administration in any country and, in fact, his Government would greatly deprecate any attempt to take sides in such matters by the Contracting Parties. They were supporting the proposal only because, in their view, it took a practical view of the situation."