I. The delegation for Belgium has asked for the following corrections to be made in document E/CONF.2/C.4/SR.11:

1. **Page 5, paragraph 3**
   "M. FORTHOMME (Belgium) supported the United Kingdom amendment. He did not agree that it entailed all the consequences set forth by other speakers and indicated that there was a tendency in the Committee to draw far too many consequences from any set of words."

2. **Page 6, paragraph 6**
   "M. FORTHOMME (Belgium), replying to Mr. HURTADO (Venezuela), said that in inserting the word 'subsequent' in the English text and 'postérieur' in the French text of his amendment, he had intended to point out that when the procedure under Article 45 had not led to any satisfactory conclusion and it was logical to go on to the procedure of Article 45 A."

II. The delegation for the United Kingdom has asked for the following alterations to be made in document E/CONF.2/C.4/SR.11:

1. **Page 3** (speech of the United Kingdom representative)
   Delete Second and Third sentences, and substitute:
   "several delegations had felt that it would be presumptuous to attempt to establish a categorical position which would hold good for all time, while others felt that to establish a position and then say that it was only applicable as a general rule would cast doubt on the validity of the position they maintained. It had therefore seemed best to leave the Organization to decide on the action to be taken when confronted with particular cases."

2. **Page 4, paragraph 1, fifth sentence - after "Chapter V or VIII"**, add "(an assumption with which the United Kingdom delegation definitely disagreed)".

3. **Page 4, paragraph 2, first sentence - Delete and substitute:**
   "Even on the above assumption Chapter V should surely remain in operation whether a public or private enterprise was concerned, at least until the third paragraph of Article 45 A had been reached and the Organization had had an opportunity to decide whether or not the investigation was justified."