Page 6, third paragraph: Amend the statement by Dr. McMILLAN (Canada) to read:

"Dr. McMILLAN (Canada) said that the Canadian delegation was very doubtful as to whether it was in the long-term interest of WHO or of any other specialized agencies to embark upon campaigns of this sort and to compete for private donations with voluntary organizations which might depend solely upon such campaigns for their revenues. Too many general campaigns might have an adverse effect on public support for those organizations and might jeopardize the response to special or emergency appeals which might be justified or required from time to time.

Although the Canadian delegation did not agree in principle with the practice, it would not oppose the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Sweden, since it appreciated that there were many Member countries which were anxious to undertake the sale of WHO seals."

Last word on page: For "organizing" read "engaged in".

Page 7, first line: For "selling" read "fund-raising". Delete the sentence beginning "The addition ...."

Page 8, fourth paragraph, third line: Delete the end of the paragraph from the words "which merely" and replace by:

"which would be part of the preamble. He preferred that the point be made a recommendation in the substantial part of the resolution."
Page 10, third paragraph, sixth line: Delete the words "and of the system of the particular organization" and replace by: "and regardless of the particular organization of the United Nations".

Last line on page: Delete the "and" at the end of the line and replace by: ", not long enough for them to study the principles."

Page 11: The first line should read: "His own Government, after a brief study, had some reservations regarding them. Consequently the best ...."

Page 16, second paragraph, eighth and ninth lines: Delete "the principles of WHO, as set forth by the delegation of the United States of America" and replace by: "the principle of uniformity as set forth".
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1. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL ON THE SALE OF WHO SEALS: Item 7.27 of the Agenda (Official Records No. 35, pp. 36-7; No. 40, p. 2; Documents A5/23 and A5/41)

The CHAIRMAN recalled that it had been decided at the previous meeting to defer consideration of the report of the Director-General on the sale of WHO seals pending the presence of a representative of the International Union Against Tuberculosis. The Secretary-General of the International Union was now present and prepared to make a statement.

Professor BERNARD (International Union Against Tuberculosis), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, recalled that the Fourth World Health Assembly had decided, under the terms of a resolution of 24 May 1951 (WHA4.48) to issue special WHO seals on a world-wide basis. That decision had given rise to a considerable degree of fear among national antituberculosis associations, a fear which had been expressed in a resolution passed by the directing council of the International Union Against Tuberculosis in September 1951, deciding that the Executive Board of WHO be requested to reconsider its attitude. The Executive Board's decision of 22 January 1952 to recommend that the Fifth Health Assembly reconsider the question of WHO seals had, by reopening the question, made it possible for him to submit the International Union's views on the subject.

For some half century the sale of antituberculosis stamps had been the most effective, and indeed often the sole, means of support available to national antituberculosis societies and leagues. He was confident that there was no need for him to remind the committee of the excellent work accomplished by those societies over so long a period, work which included propaganda activity; the
investigation and application of new curative methods, the training of personnel, and expert advice to governments. It was thus clear that any diminution of their sources of revenue would imperil their very existence as organizations and would lead to the curtailment of much valuable work. Yet there was a grave risk that the issue of the proposed WHO seals, by presenting the public with an additional claim upon its charity, would lead to precisely such a diminution and to the deleterious results ensuing therefrom.

Even if a national association, fearing the undesirable results of the parallel existence of two campaigns, were to adopt the WHO seal as its own, the harm would not be undone, since the object of a campaign was not purely financial, but was educational and instructional as well. Since, however, the precise conditions attending the incidence of tuberculosis varied from country to country, it was clear that a single, uniform seal, providing for no variations of design or subject represented, would prove only a second-rate instrument for accomplishing the purpose desired. In addition, it had been proved that a caption, adapted to local conditions and requirements, was a powerful supplement to the pictorial value of the seal. There again, however, it was difficult to appreciate how provision could be made in the case of the WHO seal for the requisite flexibility in that respect.

It was, therefore, the earnest wish of the Organization which he represented that the committee should recognize certain important considerations, which might be summarized as follows: firstly, that for the past half century the sale of antituberculosis stamps had proved one of the most fruitful activities of national antituberculosis leagues; secondly, that the campaigns for the sale of those stamps had the object of raising urgently needed funds and of performing important
propaganda work; thirdly, that in countries where no national antituberculosis associations existed it was important that that omission should be remedied as soon as possible; fourthly, that the WHO seal should not be sold in countries where campaigns for the sale of stamps were already being organized by national associations; and fifthly, that in the absence of such campaigns, WHO seals should be sold only as long as that state of affairs persisted.

In view of the past amicable relations between the International Union Against Tuberculosis and the World Health Organization, he was confident that his views would receive sympathetic consideration.

The CHAIRMAN called upon the representative of the Executive Board to present a statement in connexion with paragraph 3(7) of World Health Assembly resolution WHA4.48.

Dr. BRAVO, Representative of the Executive Board, informed the committee that, in implementation of the decisions of resolution WHA4.48, the Director-General had despatched a letter to Member States soliciting their agreement for the sale of WHO seals. Only 11 out of 69 Member Governments had agreed to undertake the sale of seals, which was to start in April 1952. At its ninth session the Executive Board was informed that the seals were already printed, that distribution to accepting countries was proceeding, and that some 15,000,000 were expected to be sold. In view of the small number of countries signifying their acceptance of the scheme, in view also of the cost of supplying the seals, which would absorb the entire 25% of the proceeds returnable to WHO, of the extra burden of work placed upon the secretariat, and of the considerations put forward by
Professor Bernard of the International Union Against Tuberculosis regarding the impact of the sale of WHO seals upon national selling campaigns - reference to which was to be found in document A5/23 - the Executive Board had adopted, with only one abstention, resolution EB9.R7 recommending to the Fifth World Health Assembly that it reconsider the question as a whole.

The preliminary remarks being concluded, the CHAIRMAN invited general observations by representatives, calling attention to the draft resolution submitted by the Swedish delegation forming part of document A5/41.

Dr. van den BERG (Netherlands) said that up to the present time no method of raising funds, whether by door-to-door appeals, by the sale of flags or stamps, or by charity performances and so on, had been regarded as the sole prerogative of any given organization. It was in fact impossible to raise funds without recourse to a method which had been used previously, and in consequence, while he could well appreciate that the sale of WHO seals in certain countries might affect the receipts of national campaigns on the same lines, he could not accept that consideration as in itself constituting grounds for the WHO to abandon its action. In any case, where the problem arose it was a national one, to be settled on a national basis: it was the responsibility of the private organization concerned to approach its own government with any requests for protective measures, and such requests should not be addressed to the WHO itself. For all those reasons it seemed to him advisable that the Health Assembly should take no steps towards abandoning the scheme itself, and his delegation would therefore be pleased to support the Swedish draft resolution. He would, however, suggest one amendment to
it, since, in his delegation's opinion, the first two paragraphs were not essential to the import of the resolution, he would prefer to see them omitted.

Mr. LARSSON (Sweden) said that he would be prepared to accept the proposed amendment.

Dr. McMILLAN (Canada) said that his Government felt that it was highly doubtful whether WHO or any other specialized agency should compete in raising funds by campaigns of the kind under discussion with private organizations which had no other means of support. Moreover, campaigns of a general nature had a lesser impact upon those towards whom they were directed than did specialized campaigns organized by highly specialized bodies, but at the same time exerted an influence sufficiently strong to detract from the results of such specialized campaigns when they were held.

However, his delegation would not oppose the Swedish draft resolution at the vote, since it believed that it contained certain safeguards, and because it was in any case the apparent wish of a considerable number of Member States to accept the WHO seals.

Mr. CALDERWOOD (United States of America) expressed his support for the remarks of the delegate of Canada. Furthermore, the point should be emphasized that the WHO should find sufficient support from the public funds which were allotted for its maintenance, without recourse to other means of financing. However, his delegation would also be prepared to accept the Swedish draft resolution, on condition that a clause be added stating that seals should not be put on sale in those countries where national associations were already organizing
selling campaigns. The addition, to take the form of a third operative paragraph, might be based on one of the five considerations which the representative of the International Union Against Tuberculosis had submitted to the committee, and would provide that the seal issued by the WHO should not be sold in those countries where campaigns for the sale of antituberculosis stamps already existed. His delegation would also wish to retain the first two paragraphs of the Swedish draft resolution, which the delegate of the Netherlands had proposed should be deleted.

Dr. SAVONEN (Finland) associated himself with the proposals of the delegate of the United States of America.

Dr. TOGBA (Liberia) pointed out that if an amendment on the lines proposed were accepted, the implication would be that the WHO had the right to institute the organization, or to refuse to institute the organization, of sales in any given country.

Dr. van den BERG, agreeing with the Liberian delegate, added that the proposed amendment of the delegate of the United States of America was in his view largely superfluous, its provisions being covered in other parts of the text.

With the approval of the delegate of the United States of America, the CHAIRMAN proposed the following text for the new paragraph 3:

RECOMMENDS to countries that they consider whether the WHO seals should be sold in a country where funds are now being raised through the sale of seals in connexion with a national antituberculosis campaign.
Dr. van den BERG considered that the proposed draft was too restrictive and that the reference in the original version of the draft resolution to the "interests of ... voluntary health agencies" provided the breadth and scope necessary to cover all possible cases. He could therefore only repeat his conviction that the Swedish draft resolution, with the omission of the first two paragraphs, as proposed by himself and accepted by the delegate of Sweden was fully adequate for the purpose in view.

Dr. TOGBA agreed with the above remarks.

Mr. MASON (New Zealand) agreed with the delegate of the Netherlands that the third paragraph of the Swedish draft resolution contained a very comprehensive general statement. To meet the wishes of those who desired special reference to the campaigns of national organizations, he would suggest that the paragraph in question be supplemented by the following words: "and in particular the interests of antituberculosis associations already raising funds by the sale of stamps or seals".

Mr. CALDERWOOD (United States of America) thought that the only drawback to the proposal of the delegate of New Zealand was that the addition was being made to a paragraph which merely took account of what was believed to be an existing state of affairs, and would not become the subject of an active recommendation by the Health Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in order to overcome the objection just raised by the delegate of the United States of America, the word "CONSIDERING" in the third paragraph of the draft resolution be amended to "RECOMMENDING", the word "will" in
Mr. CALDERWOOD accepted the Chairman's amendment, adding that under those circumstances he would withdraw his proposal for a third operative paragraph. He still, however, wished to retain the first two paragraphs occurring in the original draft.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the amendments to the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Sweden (A5/41) would be voted upon first.

**Decision:** The proposal submitted by the delegate of the Netherlands to omit the first two paragraphs of the draft resolution was rejected by 23 votes to 12, with 7 abstentions.

**Decision:** The proposal, submitted by the Chairman, to amend in the third paragraph of the draft resolution the word "Considering" to "Recommendng", and to omit the word "will", was adopted by 35 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

**Decision:** The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 38 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.


The CHAIRMAN recalled that this subject had been discussed at a previous meeting and postponed because of the introduction of amendments and further resolutions. There were now three draft resolutions for consideration: the original proposal of the United Kingdom Delegation which was contained in
document A5/18, a proposal by the delegation of the United States of America (document A5/AFL/15 Rev.1) and a joint proposal of the delegations of Ceylon, Egypt, Iraq, and the Philippines which had been circulated that morning (document A5/AFL/20). He invited the sponsors of each of these proposals to make further comments.

Mr. MELLS (United Kingdom) had nothing to add to the recommendation of his delegation, to be found on page 4 of document A5/18. He suggested that a decision might be taken on paragraph (1) of that recommendation:

That a 5 per cent. minus differential be applied to salaries of internationally recruited WHO staff in Geneva forthwith.

Mr. CALDERWOOD (United States of America) said it was because of the importance and complexity of the question that his delegation had submitted the proposal contained in document A5/AFL/15 Rev. 1. It was of first importance that there should be equality and uniformity in the treatment of all employees of United Nations and its specialized agencies, regardless of where they might be located and of the system of the particular organization for which they might be working.

For this reason his delegation had put forward at the Fourth World Health Assembly the resolution to which he had referred in the previous discussion, but, as he had also pointed out in that discussion, the situation had now changed, and his delegation thought that at the present time the Assembly should confine itself to a statement of the principle which would emphasize the importance of obtaining this uniformity. The principles considered by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) had only been available to governments for a short time and
his own Government had some reservations regarding them. Therefore the best procedure would be for the Assembly to assert the importance of obtaining a uniform salary system which would ensure equal pay for comparable work and to take no action at the present time to prejudice the accomplishment of this end.

Dr. ELICANO (Philippines) was of the opinion that the objections raised by the delegates of the United States of America and of the United Kingdom had already been satisfactorily explained in the report of the Executive Board and by the Secretary on behalf of the Director-General. In view of the findings of the Executive Board that the cost of living had risen in Geneva as well as in New York, it would appear fair that the 5% minus differential be not applied.

Mr. SIEGEL (Assistant Director-General, Administration and Finance), Secretary, spoke on behalf of the Director-General, who had hoped to be able to attend the meeting, but had been prevented. He reiterated what he had said at a previous meeting, that the foremost consideration of WHO must be the necessity for having a uniform set of principles which could be applied throughout the Organization: that it was more important that there be uniformity within WHO than uniformity as between WHO and the United Nations and other specialized agencies.

He invited the attention of the committee to pages 4, 5 and 6 of A5/52 containing the report of the special committee appointed by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) to review the question of salary differentials and reach agreement on a set of principles which could be applied in all branches of the United Nations and specialized agencies. The committee was composed of representatives from the United Nations, the International Labour Office, UNESCO,
ICAO, FAO and WHO - virtually all the international organizations concerned. The special committee had unanimously adopted the set of principles contained in document A5/52 and had recommended that the plan it outlined should be put into operation as rapidly as possible, and that the agencies take appropriate steps to submit the proposal to their governing bodies.

It was following that recommendation that the Director-General had submitted the principles, with his recommendation for adoption to the present Health Assembly. The Health Assembly was the first meeting of any of the international organizations concerned to be convened since the decision taken by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. Some States which were not Members of other branches of the United Nations were Members of WHO, and similarly there were Members of other United Nations organizations which were not Members of WHO; it was most desirable that the Fifth Health Assembly should indicate either its approval or disapproval of the principles which were before it, so that its decision would be known to the other bodies when they met in the near future. He believed that the resolution contained in document A5/AFL/20 would meet that requirement and he hoped it would be adopted for recommendation to the Assembly.

Mr. LETHBRIDGE, representative of the United Nations, speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, said that he was awaiting a brief from New York on this subject and, having no instructions, he could not usefully comment at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN summarized the main points raised:

(1) the necessity to provide for uniformity of conditions of employment and remuneration of international civil servants working in a comparable capacity, and
(2) uniformity of treatment of members of the staff of WHO.

He proposed to adopt the following procedure: to regard the United Kingdom proposal (document A5/18) as the original resolution and to regard the proposal of the United States of America as furthest removed, and therefore to consider that first.

Mr. MASON (New Zealand) emphasized that WHO had autonomy in the matter of deciding what its salary scales and system of salary adjustments were to be. It was only pledged to consult with the United Nations in such matters (Article XII(b) of Agreement with the United Nations). In this particular case, the principles approved by the Executive Board at its last meeting had not yet been considered by the United Nations. There was no reason why, because the Geneva staffs of ILO and United Nations were treated in a certain way, the officials of WHO should be treated in exactly the same way, if it was not thought practical or equitable to do so.

Mr. Mason had participated in discussions of other organizations concerning salary scales and allowances, and on all such occasions the opinions of the Staff Associations had been presented. He thought the same should apply on the present occasion.

As to the new scheme discussed by the Executive Board, which the United Nations had not yet tried to work out, let alone approve, it certainly had the virtue that it would give an equitable system in giving cost-of-living allowances in various circumstances all over the world and not merely New York and Geneva. It seemed equitable and practical and to that extent the New Zealand delegation would
approve of its adoption: but, since the matter had to be brought before the United Nations in approximately a year's time, he felt that the Treasury experts of the various Member States would, no doubt, make a much better study of the problem than had been made hitherto, and for that reason WHO should not commit itself completely and absolutely to the system, subject to no modification later.

He would suggest a compromise between the proposal of the United States and the joint proposal contained in A5/AFL/20:

That the resolution A5/AFL/20 be amended to read:

1. APPROVES in the meantime the system for cost-of-living adjustments proposed by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination;
2. URGES the United Nations and other specialized agencies to give the fullest consideration to the system of cost-of-living adjustments embodied in these principles;
and a third clause be added

3. DECIDES that the system shall be reviewed at the Sixth World Health Assembly.

M. FOESSEL (France) pointed out that in the resolution submitted by the delegations of Ceylon, Egypt, Iraq, and the Philippines (document A5/AFL/20), the second part of Section II, "Authorises the Director-General ..." seemed to recommend adoption of the principles contained in Annex 16 of the report of the Executive Board at its ninth session (Official Records No. 40, page 128, para. 9.6.) reading "The Director-General does not recommend the application of a maximum limit, etc. . . examined by the Board." What was the practical bearing of these provisions if they were rendered applicable by the adoption of a resolution? On a question which was so
important in its financial implications, could it be left to the Executive Board to take a decision of principle which would be immediately applicable, or was it considered that the Board should only give advice and this advice should not take effect except by decisions of the next Assembly?

The CHAIRMAN suggested that this point was covered by the second half of paragraph II of the resolution "Authorizes the Director-General to follow the decision of the Executive Board on this point until such time, etc. ...".

M. FOESSEL (France) replied that, from that paragraph, he had the impression that the Director-General could apply the principles proposed in Annex 16 without awaiting the recommendation of the ACC.

The SECRETARY explained that Section II of A5/AFL/20 dealt only with one point of principle, but had no connexion with the application of a maximum to subsequent cost-of-living adjustments, which was the point of principle on which ACC had not reached a conclusion.

M. FOESSEL (France) cited the decision of the United Nations regarding its own staff under which there was no question of applying an increase on the whole of the salary, but only that part of the salary corresponding to the actual needs of each individual.

The SECRETARY, requested by the Chairman to comment on the suggestion that the opinions of the Staff Committee be ascertained, said this question had been raised in the Executive Board and the Director-General had reported that the Staff Committee
of WHO were in complete agreement with the principles which he had presented, which were the same as those agreed to by ACC. A joint Staff Association existed in Geneva, representing staff committees of different organizations, which had adopted a resolution indicating that they felt that the 5% differential at present in effect for staff of the United Nations and ILO in Geneva should be discontinued, but the Joint Association had dealt only with principles as affecting Geneva and not everywhere.

Mr. CALDERWOOD (United States of America) said the present discussion had confirmed his feelings regarding the complexity of the matter. He agreed with much of what had been said by the delegate of New Zealand, particularly with his remarks about the necessity of governments studying the proposals made by ACC. His delegation did not feel free to approve the principles, even provisionally, as would be the case if the resolution submitted by the delegations of Ceylon, Egypt, Iraq and the Philippines were adopted. It seemed desirable at this time to affirm the principles of WHO, as set forth by the delegation of the United States of America in document A5/15 Rev. 1, and not to take any action which would prejudice the decision to bring about uniform practice throughout the United Nations' system.

Mr. MELLS (United Kingdom) said his delegation must oppose adoption of the resolution in document A5/AFL/20 on the grounds that it was far too early to adopt a proposal of this nature. The recommendations of the ACC had only been circulated quite recently and delegations had not had time to study them.

Mr. MASON (New Zealand) asked what was the history of the principles of the ACC.
The SECRETARY thought it sufficient instead of repeating all the past history, to refer the committee to the discussion at the Fourth World Health Assembly leading to the adoption of resolution WHA4.53, which embodied principles now dealt with in the complete set of principles. Subsequently the matter had again been considered by the ACC which had reported to the United Nations General Assembly. No action had then been taken regarding the establishment of a set of general principles to be applied everywhere, but the Fifth Committee of the United Nations had considered separately a problem affecting New York staff.

The Executive Board in its ninth session in January 1952 had had before it the Director-General's proposals for establishment of a complete set of principles which were based on, and consistent with the recommendations of the ACC.

Therefore a considerable time had elapsed between the submission of those principles and the current Assembly, and the proposals were certainly not entirely new. The details of the system were set out in Official Records No. 40 and had been available to governments for some weeks. It had just happened that the ACC decision taken only four weeks previously had followed those same principles adopted by the Executive Board.

M. FOESSEL (France) urged the committee to consider the gravity of the decision they were about to take. A certain number of governments had not yet accepted or had refused to accept, the principle of adjusting salaries on the basis of the cost of living. The members of this committee were representing their governments and they could not adopt on an international scale provisions which they could not accept nationally. He maintained his opinion that any cost of living bonus should not be calculated on the total salary as a whole but should be based only on a given proportion of it.
Mr. MASON (New Zealand), referring to the procedure proposed by the Chairman for voting on the different proposals, was strongly of opinion that the proposal of his delegation, being an amendment to the draft resolution of Ceylon, Egypt, Iraq and the Philippines, should be voted upon first, before the original proposal was considered.

Discussion took place on procedure, in which the following took part: the delegations of the United States of America, New Zealand, and Iran. In accordance with Rule 55 of the Rules of Procedure, the Chairman's decision was accepted, and the committee agreed to vote first upon the draft resolution contained in document A5/AFL/15 Rev.1.

Decision: The resolution proposed by the delegation of the United States of America (document A5/AFL/15 Rev.1) was adopted by 19 votes to 13, with 8 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN ruled that this resolution having been adopted the other resolutions and amendments lapsed.

It was so agreed.

Mr. MK:LS (United Kingdom), stated the views of his Government on the general question of cost-of-living issues.

It was the view of the United Kingdom Government that, subject to establishing the initial salary differential as between New York and Geneva, salary adjustments based on cost-of-living changes should have reference only to the local cost of living, so that, in effect, New York and Geneva should eventually move independently on that question. In particular, offices of the United Nations and specialized agencies with headquarters in Geneva should consider their own positions separately, taking decisions on the merits
of the case depending on local circumstances and not on what was happening elsewhere.

In the long run the salaries of the staff of WHO and other specialized agencies centred in Geneva might be expected to move broadly in line with those paid by the United Nations office in Geneva.

On the general question of cost-of-living allowances, the United Kingdom Government considered that any system of automatic adjustment of wages and salaries in relation to a cost-of-living index figure was open to serious objection. It might provide an undue degree of protection to the staffs concerned compared with that enjoyed by the majority of other members of the community; moreover, applied on any considerable scale, such systems had an inflationary effect. The United Kingdom Government were opposed to any principle of automatic adjustment based on a statistical formula reviewed at regular intervals. Officials of international organizations already enjoyed, in general, favourable salaries and emoluments and certain special privileges, which was all the more reason why they should not be rendered immune from economic developments in the country where they were serving. Wages of locally recruited staff, where they had been fixed in relation to wages in other local employments, should not be increased solely on the ground that an increase of salary had been granted to the more highly graded staff of the Organization.

That did not mean that the pay of international civil servants should not be adjusted if the circumstances of their employment changed materially, but it did imply that adjustments should not necessarily, or indeed normally, cover the whole amount of any change in the cost of living, but should aim particularly at relieving hardship at the lower salary levels without increasing such salaries out of proportion to those in comparable local employments. Adjustments at the middle and higher salary levels should
normally be less favourable than in respect of the lower grades.

The views of the United Kingdom Government on the question might be summarized as follows:

(a) that salary adjustments should not be made automatically because of changes indicated by the local cost-of-living index;
(b) that adjustments should not be conceded solely for the purpose of compensating employees for changes in the cost-of-living as measured by a particular index, and, where conceded, should be no more than adequate to reflect appreciable changes in the rates of remuneration received by persons of comparable status (other than those employed by international organizations) in the same area;
(c) that salary adjustments should provide less than full compensation for increases in the local cost of living in the case of junior, or lower paid staff and should be tapered to provide still less, or possibly no compensation for higher grade staff.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.