

Senator JAVITS. Do you have any opinion on whether that is the kind of thing you want to see happen?

Mr. LEDOGAR. Well, again, going on the newspaper report, it appears the United States adopted a generally conservative position, as opposed to Sweden, with regard to the revealing of information.

For example—apparently because the United States prevailed—the convention, or the agreement, calls for public revealing of the operating results and sales by geographical area rather than by country, and I suspect the case was similar with regard to No. 7, which calls for revealing research and development expenditures for the enterprise as a whole, rather than research and development expenditures by country.

Now, in the case of the OECD countries, this may not be as important as in the case of less developed countries.

What I've urged is that in such negotiations the United States adopt an attitude which is not so defensive of the interest of business and not consistently take the stance that seems to be represented here.

Senator JAVITS. Well, I was with Secretary Kissinger and I believe that a most enlightened and forward-looking setup of proposals was made to the developing countries.

I was also his adviser at the session of the United Nations General Assembly in early September last year where again we observed the advanced proposals.

I did not consider those particularly reactionary or conservative.

Now, all I am raising, Mr. Ledogar, is that these may be your views, but you are not God either, neither am I or anybody else. They are your views and you have opinions, but that does not mean that the United States is wrong. That is all I raise with you.

This happens to be in the business I know something about which is the international practices of transnational corporations.

I am interested in your view about the substance, and I think that is a much stronger argument, if you will allow me to suggest it to you, the ultimate fact is because there is a lot to economics and a lot to business, more than the evidence on which you base it.

For example, I would not indict a company as guilty of giving bribes on a parliamentary speech or the report of a newspaper.

You are saying you are reporting a fact that the paper said so and so and a member of Parliament said the same thing, but that does not necessarily convict an enterprise.

It would take a lot more proof than that as illustrated in the investigation by the subcommittee headed by Frank Church.

I am impressed with the fact that the kinds of medicines, at the kind of price that should be helping the many millions of people, with all kinds of intestinal illnesses in countries like Brazil, are simply not made available because, you say, it is not profitable to do so.

Now, do you recommend that the United States offer aid of that kind?

The United States can give direct aid in tons of aspirin or anything else it wants to, is that not so?

Mr. LEDOGAR. I do recommend U.S. aid of a certain kind.

Very often, in the past, U.S. aid has been tied in with the development of the subsidiaries of the U.S. corporations.