

United Nations
CONFERENCE
ON
TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT

Nations Unies
CONFERENCE
DU
COMMERCE ET DE L'EMPLOI

RESTRICTED

E/CONF.2/C.6/W.9
27 December 1947

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SIXTH COMMITTEE: ORGANIZATION

SUB-COMMITTEE ON ARTICLE 75 (COMPOSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD)

SUMMARY RECORD OF FIFTH MEETING

Held 26 December 1947 at 4.00 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. JABBARA (Syria)

Mr. ALAYZA (Peru) said that the principle of free election must serve as a basis of discussion. This being so, the sub-committee needed to define the criteria for the election. He broadly agreed with the criteria contained in paragraph 2 of the United States draft (document E/CONF.2/C.6/W.5). Of these criteria (b) and (c) must be preponderate. However this paragraph was too vague. The criterion of chief economic importance must fall within the other criteria and should not stand alone. He questioned whether under paragraph 3 there would be a free election or an election on the basis of a previously established statistical list. He could not support an election of the latter type.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) explained that his draft was an effort to put into formal language the remarks he had made before. The election under paragraph 3 would be something between a free election and the rubberstamping of a previously prepared list. It would not be a free election in the sense that Members would not have to exercise some sense of responsibility. The matter depended upon the rules to be established under paragraph 5. The annex referred to in paragraph 4 would contain the Members to be elected at the first election. The second sentence of that paragraph should be in square brackets.

The Sub-committee proceeded to examine the United States draft in an effort to ascertain whether it could be used as a basis of discussion.

Mr. COLBAN (Norway) considered that the United States draft might be taken as a basis of discussion, although he had several drafting amendments to offer to it. He also thought that paragraph 3 (a) should not be limited to any number of states.

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) thought that the United States draft might serve as a basis of compromise. He agreed with the three criteria mentioned but pointed out that the draft postponed for a later conference the problem of
/how to give

how to give due regard to the three criteria. He disagreed with the delegate of Norway that the number of states of chief importance in international trade should not be specified.

Mr. FAYAT (Belgium) said that no member of the Benelux Customs Union would object to paragraph 1 of the United States draft. He preferred the first of the two alternatives set out in paragraph 2. He thought that paragraph 3 (a) went a long way to satisfy the point of view of those who do not wish to see permanent seats on the Board established. He agreed that the states of chief economic importance in international trade for the first election might be mentioned in the annex referred to in paragraph 4.

Mr. COOMBS (Australia) thought it was neither necessary nor desirable to write into the Charter principles to guide elections to the Board and in any case he did not think that this would be an effective way of achieving the desired objective. There was no merit in laying down principles unless the method of election later approved took them all into account. However, the method of election specified in the United States draft only took the first principle into account.

The essence of the United States proposal was contained in paragraph 3 (a). He questioned why the eight states of chief importance in international trade should be established by a vote. There was no difficulty after studying statistics to determine the first two states in this number of eight. However, it would be extremely difficult to establish the remaining six states on the basis of objective statistics. In that case he doubted whether such statistics would form the sole basis for the election.

Mr. WUNSZ-KING (China) thought that the United States draft was generally acceptable. The factors of population, external trade and national income should be taken into account in assessing the states of chief importance in international trade. It would be necessary to give due representation in this category for the various stages of economic development. He thought that if the phrase "chief importance in international trade" was objectionable wording similar to that used for the Security Council in the Charter of the United Nations might be employed.

Mr. MONDELLO (Italy) thought that the United States draft might be taken as a basis for discussion but he was opposed to paragraph 3 (a).

Mr. KOJEVE (France) disagreed with the statement of the delegate of Australia that it was not necessary to set out principles to guide the elections to the Board. He considered that a strict formula should not be used but that certain principles must be laid down in order to enable the Conference to decide borderline cases and to increase confidence in the
/Organization.

Organization. He thought that it was more important to ensure the general diversity of the Board than the representation of states of chief economic importance. He agreed with the delegate of Belgium that the annex mentioned in paragraph 4 might contain a list of states to be elected possibly to serve as a model.
