Consideration of Paragraph 2 of Article 95 (Amendments)

In the absence of any body of support for that part of the amendment of the delegation of Mexico which aimed at deleting the second sentence of paragraph 2, the sub-committee considered whether any amendment should be made to the text prepared by the Preparatory Committee.

Mr. KOJEVE (France) suggested a compromise solution comprising four points:

(a) the determination by the Conference that any amendment was of the importance envisaged in the second sentence should be by a majority of two-thirds of the Members;

(b) the phrase "within a period specified by the Conference" in the second sentence should be amended to read "within a reasonable period";

(c) a Member not accepting an amendment of the greater importance type should be suspended from membership and not forced to withdraw;

(d) in the last sentence the phrase "upon the expiration of six months" should be replaced by "upon the expiration of a period not greater than six months".

A majority in the Sub-Committee supported the first amendment suggested by the representative of France.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) said that he was prepared to accept this amendment but only if the majority required to approve an amendment of the type in question was also changed to two-thirds of the Members.

A majority of the members of the Sub-Committee also was in favour of accepting the third amendment suggested by the representative of France.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) was prepared to accept this amendment providing that it meant complete suspension from membership.

It was agreed that the representatives of Mexico and the United States /should form a
should form a working group to prepare a redraft of paragraph 2 in the light of the discussion which had taken place.

Consideration on Paragraph 3 of Article 95

It was agreed that the majority specified should be amended to "two-thirds of the Members present and voting."