

SIXTH COMMITTEE: ORGANIZATION

SUB-COMMITTEE ON ARTICLE 75

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Held 20 December 1947 at 10:30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. JABBARA (Syria)

The Sub-Committee discussed the size of the Executive Board.

Mr. COLBAN (Norway) said he thought that the maximum number of Members of the Board should be seventeen.

Mr. KOJEFVE (France) supported a maximum of seventeen and a minimum of fifteen members as proposed by Cuba but had no objection to one figure of seventeen as a maximum. He pointed out that assessment of the correct figure, however, depended upon the number of countries to be given permanent seats if such a system were to be adopted.

Mr. MONDELLO (Italy) thought that the number of members should be eighteen, while Mr. SCARPATI (Argentina) supported the Cuban proposal.

Mr. GAZDER (Pakistan) thought that the figure of fifteen would make for efficiency but he had no objection to a figure of eighteen. The proportion of great powers upon the Board to other countries represented should be one to three.

Mr. MACHADO (Cuba) explained that the Cuban proposal was based on the principle of elasticity as the size of the Board depended upon a number of factors which could not be decided at the Havana Conference.

Mr. PARANAGUA (Brazil) considered that if the Organization were to have say, forty-five Members, a figure of eighteen was not exaggerated. He quoted his experience in the International Monetary Fund in support of this figure.

Mr. ALAYZA (Peru) thought that it was difficult to fix a figure at this stage but that the figure of eighteen might be adopted provisionally. The Economic and Social Council was composed of eighteen members.

Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) thought that it was difficult to set a figure at this time as the functions of members of the Board were not known.

/He considered

He considered the Sub-Committee might agree provisionally that some figure would be selected finally in the range fifteen to twenty.

Mr. STINEBOWER (United States) agreed that it was difficult to fix a figure when it was not clear just how the Board would operate. However, it must be possible to set some limits which, if exceeded, might impair efficiency. These limits he thought were fifteen and eighteen. Experience showed that a sliding scale as proposed by Cuba was a little use in practice. Whatever figure was fixed, it could always be amended under Article 95.

Mr. WUNSZ-KING (China) said that whatever figure was chosen, it should not be such as might make the Board appear an inner circle. If there were to be sixty Members of the Organization a Board of twenty was reasonable. He suggested the Cuban proposal be adopted provisionally.

Mr. TANGE (Australia) suggested the figure of eighteen be accepted subject to review in the light of future discussion. Article 95 enabled this figure to be amended later if necessary. He preferred a single figure to be set rather than a sliding scale.

Mr. VANER (Turkey) pointed out the five factors which should be considered in assessing the size of the Board. Only one of these factors was known at the present time. Any figure selected must therefore be arbitrary in some degree. Experience showed a maximum of eighteen was desirable.

Mr. COUILLARD (Canada) said that it was necessary to make the Board such a size as would be both efficient and representative. His delegation had therefore moved from the figure of fifteen which it had favoured in the Preparatory Committee towards the figure of seventeen, although it would not object to the figure of eighteen.

Mr. KARMARKAR (India) thought that the figure of eighteen was neither too large nor too small and it would enable all relevant interests to be represented.

Mr. FAYAT (Belgium) proposed that the figure of eighteen be accepted provisionally.

The CHAIRMAN declared that the general feeling of the Sub-Committee was that the figure of eighteen should be accepted provisionally.

-----