The sub-committee continued its discussion of the method of constituting the Executive Board.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) said that the sub-committee had yet to face up to the practical problem of establishing the criteria for membership of the Board. Whether these criteria were established or not in the Charter, certain criteria would always be borne in mind by delegates at an election of members of the Board. He did not think that there was any doubt that the United States would always have a seat upon the Board irrespective of what criteria were established, but if one went further down the list of states which were to be given automatic seats it became very difficult to assess the merits of the claims of competing states. For example, he did not see how a resultant could be struck between the criteria of population and extent of trade.

He agreed with the delegate of the United States that if certain states were given automatic seats by the Charter there must be provisions in the Charter for reviewing the list and amending it. Therefore the criteria upon which the list was established must also be written in to the text, but the question still remained whether it was possible to establish criteria.

Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would find great difficulty in accepting any solution which did not mention for the first period of the life of the Organization the criterion of chief economic importance. The use of this criterion for this period would also have to be regarded as a precedent. He thought that if states were designated in the Charter as entitled to seats on the Board, the list of them should not be immutable but should only be changed for very strong reasons. A common feature of Alternatives A, B and C was provision to ensure continuity and the reason for this was the need to take full advantage of the membership in the Organization of states of chief economic importance. This being the case, there was no reason why this need should not be recognized by designating /those states
those states in the Charter as entitled to seats on the Board. His delegation considered that if there were not to be a system of weighted voting the Executive Board must be so composed as to recognize the greater contribution which certain states could make to the work of the Organization.

Mr. KARMAKKAR (India) thought that one of the criteria to be established must be that of chief economic importance and that the states satisfying this criterion must have seats upon the Board. However, he thought that representation must also be allowed to other countries which had similar types of economies and which were able to form one economic unit, as well as representation of regions. He suggested that eight seats be given to states of chief economic importance, three seats to the states of Latin America, one seat to the states of the Middle East, one seat to the remaining states of the British Commonwealth and that the five remaining seats should be filled by simple election. He felt that India should be considered as one of the states of chief economic importance.

Mr. MONDELLO (Italy) said that he maintained his preference for Alternative B. If Alternative C were to be accepted, Italy would probably find herself in the unfortunate position of being ninth upon the list of states of chief economic importance. Any scheme of geographical representation must give due representation to the countries of the Mediterranean peninsula. He thought that the only possible compromise would be a combination of Alternatives B and C.

Mr. WUNZ-KING (China) did not see why it would be difficult for the sub-committee to establish criteria for membership of the Board. All delegates seemed to agree that seats must be given to the states of chief economic importance. The factors which must be considered in assessing this importance were population, national income and foreign trade. All delegates also seemed to agree that the Board must represent different types of economies and regions. He would be in favour of any formula which would satisfy all other delegates.

Mr. VANER (Turkey) said that the main qualities of the Organization must be vitality and continuity. The main qualities of the Executive Board must be representativeness and impartiality. To be representative the Board must give due representation to states of chief economic importance, to different types of economies and to regions. He therefore considered that the question before the sub-committee was essentially a technical one and that it was necessary to be precise. The solution of the delegate of France was too vague.

Mr. FAYAT (Belgium) said that the sub-committee generally agreed that criteria for membership of the Board must be established. Most delegates /also agreed
also agreed that seats must be reserved for states of chief economic importance. However, he thought that it would be difficult to find a formula which would solve the problem of marginal cases. If it were not possible to find such a formula, the sub-committee must fall back on the empirical approach and list the states entitled to seats on the Board. This list would guarantee prospective members continuity and stability in the Organization. There would be no question of any state being entitled to a permanent seat as the Charter could always be amended. He thought that in any such list due account must be taken of the existence of customs unions.

Mr. KOJEVE (France) emphasized that he was opposed to quantitative criteria but not to qualitative criteria. He pointed out the dangers involved in quantitative criteria. He had no objection to the insertion of criteria in the proposal of his delegation to show the basis upon which the list of states was drawn up but he thought it would be impossible to establish such criteria. He agreed that continuity and stability were needed in the Board. He suggested that the sub-committee should try and establish some objective criteria. If it found it could not do this, it should endeavour to draw up a list of states entitled to seats on the Board. If agreement could not be reached upon this list, Alternative B should be taken as a basis for discussion.