The Sub-Committee discussed the method of constituting the Executive Board.

Mr. KOJÈVE (France) explained that the proposal made by the delegation of France and included in the annotated draft agenda meant that the Board would consist of eighteen members all of whom would be elected by the Conference. Certain states to be agreed upon at the present Conference, whose names would be inserted in the Charter, would, ipso facto, be elected by a simple majority vote; the remaining members of the Board should be elected by a two-thirds majority vote.

Mr. COLBAN (Norway) emphasized that delegates were not fighting over the issue whether there should be permanent seats on the Board or not, but they were endeavouring to find a formula ensuring that the great economic powers as well as other relevant interests should be given their due representation.

Mr. MACHADO (Cuba) strongly supported alternative B which embodied the principle of the free election by the Conference of all members of the Board.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) said that his delegation was not so much interested in having a number of permanent seats upon the Board as it was in seeing that criteria were established for membership, and that these criteria were satisfied in practice. Alternative B did not lay down any such criteria. He attached great importance to one of the criteria specified in alternative C, namely, that of chief economic importance. He also agreed that other criteria should include adequate geographical representation as well as the representation of diverse types of economy.

After establishing the above criteria the question arose as to what kind of weight should be attached to each of them. He thought that giving eight seats out of a total membership of eighteen to states of chief economic importance, as proposed in alternative C, was not to pay undue regard to the first criterion he had mentioned. It was true that this appeared to compose...
almost one half of the Board as a result of this criterion but the criteria overlapped.

It had been suggested that it would be better to have all members of the Board elected by the Conference. He had no objection to the principle of electing all members but alternative C, by specifying that the states of chief economic importance would be determined by the Conference every three years, went very close to a process of election.

He criticized the proposal of the delegation of France on the ground that it did not lay down any criteria as the basis for appointment to the Board.

Mr. KOUVE (France) appreciated the need for continuity in the operations of the Board but he thought there were certain dangers in the methods of ensuring continuity. The proposal of the delegation of France was therefore flexible. It was difficult to define the criteria mentioned by the delegate of the United States. The list of countries specified in the French proposal did, however, take account of certain principles enunciated at the Drafting Committee of the Preparatory Committee and it could be discussed on the basis of criteria the sub-committee established. He thought that the French proposal satisfied all the considerations which had been advanced and he still considered it to be the best solution.

Mr. GAZDER (Pakistan) said that the primary criterion to be observed was that of volume of trade of the type which would help the economic development of other countries.

Mr. COUILLARD (Canada) said that the Executive Board must be composed in an equitable and wise manner. To be equitable it must be representative and to be wise it must be acceptable to all the Members of the Organization. Representativeness rested firstly on the meeting of the legitimate interests of the major economic powers and upon a combination of geographical representation and representation of various stages of economic development. The interests of the major economic powers could easily be satisfied, either by designation in the Charter or by a formula, but any satisfactory formula would be difficult to obtain. However, whether the interests of the major economic powers were satisfied by designation or by formula, "permanent" seats would not be provided as the Charter could always be amended. It would not be so easy to give due allowance for geographical representation and representation for the various stages of economic development. However, the Food and Agriculture Organization had solved this problem.

It must be remembered that the Organization would be a functional one and the relation between the Conference and the Executive Board must be always borne in mind. Now that the question of weighted voting was provisionally and tentatively solved, the Conference would be clearly the sovereign body of the Organization.