

The CHAIRMAN noted that a consensus appeared to have emerged in favour of retaining article 31. That article should, however, be referred to the Working Group so that it could improve the text in the light of the observations which had been made regarding it, in particular by the Mexican delegation.

#### Article 32

The CHAIRMAN noted that no delegation had expressed a wish to speak on article 32 and he suggested that it would be considered adopted.

It was so decided.

#### Article 33

Mr. BURGUCHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he thought that article 33, which contained a special reservation in favour of States which had ratified the 1964 ULIS, was not justified from either the legal or the practical viewpoint. He therefore requested that the article should be deleted.

Mr. ROGNLIEN (Norway) said that the Working Group had drafted a new version of article 33 which extended the application of that provision to States Parties to any Convention on the international sales of goods, without restricting it, as the present text did, to States Parties to the 1964 ULIS. According to the new version, article 33 could be applied, inter alia, to the revised ULIS. The justification for the article was evident since, without the reservation contained therein, it would appear difficult to ask States which had already ratified an instrument on sales containing a certain definition of international sales to adopt another on limitation containing another definition of international sales.

Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) shared the view of the representative of the Soviet Union. Article 33, which ran counter to the uniformity sought, would, in fact, raise insuperable difficulties with regard to the application of the Convention between a country which had ratified the 1964 ULIS and a third country. It might, however, be thought that article 33 applied in conditions similar to those of article 31 and that States Parties to the 1964 ULIS could have recourse to it only in respect of relations between themselves.