

WORLD HEALTH
ORGANIZATIONORGANISATION MONDIALE
DE LA SANTÉSEVENTH WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLYA7/AFL/Min/13
17 May 1954

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE AND LEGAL MATTERS
PROVISIONAL MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETINGPalais des Nations, Geneva
Monday, 17 May 1954, at 2.30 p.m.

CHAIRMAN: Dr. M. JAFAR (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

1. Amendments to the Constitution of the World Health Organization on membership of the Executive Board: Item proposed by the Governments of Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (continued).
2. Draft second report of the Committee on Administration, Finance and Legal Matters to the Committee on Programme and Budget.
3. Consideration of a system of cost-of-living adjustments.
4. United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund: WHO Staff Pension Committee: Appointments of representatives to replace members whose period of membership expires.
5. Annual report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board for 1952.
6. Accommodation for the Headquarters Office: report on the cost of the new building and on measures taken pursuant to resolution WHA6.36.
7. Report on co-ordination with the United Nations and Specialized Agencies on Administrative and Legal Questions.
8. Form and presentation of the annual programme and budget estimates.
9. Report on the situation regarding the Regional Committee for the Eastern Mediterranean.

Note: Corrections to these provisional minutes should be submitted in writing to the Chief, Records Service, Room A.278 within 48 hours of their distribution or as soon as possible thereafter.

1. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION ON MEMBERSHIP OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD: Item proposed by the Governments of Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Item 7.12 of the Agenda (Documents A7/2 and Add. 1 and 2, A7/5, A7/AFL/26, AFL/WP/7) (continued)

Mr. BOUCHER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said he had that morning listened with much interest and with growing regret to the delegate of Norway's remarks on the membership of the Executive Board. The delegate of Norway, apparently suffering from a certain apprehension, had made assumptions outside the matter before the Committee. He knew that the delegate of Norway thought that many countries should leave the Executive Board; in his view that might constitute a reason for their remaining on the Board. He was confident, however, that the remainder of the Committee was quite capable of judging for itself on the matter without receiving any exhortations from him.

The United Kingdom Government's proposal was for an increase in the number of members on the Executive Board which would take account of the increase in the membership of the Organization itself. Such a step, which had already been taken by other specialized agencies would give a greater number of countries, the opportunity of sharing in the execution of the Organization's work.

Dr. BERGES SANTANA (Dominican Republic) said his Government had not intended to take any initiative with regard to the amendment of the Constitution but when the amendments proposed by Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom had been received, his Government had felt that it should express its views on the matter. Since the proposal made by his Government had not been submitted six months in advance, as required by Article 73 of the Constitution, and was therefore

not considered admissible as a separate proposal, he requested the Chairman to ask the Committee to authorize discussion of document A7/5 as an amendment to the joint proposal contained in document A7/2. Since both proposals would increase the membership of the Executive Board from 18 to 24, he felt that his delegation's proposal could quite properly be considered an amendment.

Dr. de PINHO (Portugal) said the Committee had before it the joint proposals for amendment of the Constitution (document A7/2) the aim of which was to increase the membership of the Executive Board from 18 to 24. That increase was considered necessary to ensure greater continuity in the work of the Board and a more equitable distribution of seats on it. In his opinion, a mere increase in the number of members did not necessarily ensure a more equitable distribution of seats, although it undoubtedly increased its possibility. Without wishing to be sceptical, he pointed out that adoption of the proposal would entail an estimated additional cost for meetings of the Board and its committees of \$10,500 per annum. Despite his doubts as to the automatic success of the proposal, his delegation would, in a spirit of co-operation, vote for a proposal the only aim of which was to increase the membership of the Board from 18 to 24. In that sense, his delegation endorsed what had been said by the delegate of Belgium.

Professor de LAET (Belgium) believed it a fundamental error to consider as an amendment a motion which was essentially different in all respects from the joint proposal. The joint proposal dealt solely with the number of members on the Board and in no way involved the status of members. He therefore felt that

such a fundamentally different motion as that of the Dominican Republic must be considered a separate proposal. If the question gave rise to any difficulties of interpretation, he would be glad to have the legal advice of the Secretariat on it.

Dr. van den BERG (Netherlands) said he had heard the delegate of Norway's statement that morning with interest. The delegate of Norway generally employed cogent arguments in defence of a position, whether weak or strong, but that morning his defence of a weak situation had itself been weak. The delegate of Norway had not been in a position to attack the joint proposal on its own merits. He had therefore attacked it on grounds which had nothing to do with the proposal. He had stated that the proposal dealt not only with the composition of the Board but also with its status merely because some of the sponsors of the joint proposal had in the past attacked the independent nature of the Board. While it was easy to state in a meeting that the members of the Board should be independent representatives acting in their personal capacity, it was not so easy to translate that sentiment into practice. One of the few ways of doing so was by nominating to the Board members who did not belong to the same country as the nominator. One of the only two countries which had done so, thereby proving its attachment to the principle of the independence of the Board, was Belgium. The argument of the delegate of Norway in that connexion was therefore completely without foundation.

Three reasons could be advanced to justify the joint proposal itself and any one of those alone would be sufficient justification. In the first place, since

the inception of WHO there had been a large increase in the number of its Members. Obviously there should be a certain relationship between the total membership of the Organization and the membership of the Executive Board. The delegate of Norway had stated that morning that when WHO had been founded and a membership of 18 had been agreed on for the Executive Board, it had been borne in mind that the membership of WHO should eventually be universal. Dr. van den Berg, however, pointed out that at the meeting in New York eight years previously it had not been at all certain that all countries in the world would eventually become Members of WHO.

Secondly, WHO was the specialized agency which had the largest membership. Nearly all the other specialized agencies, whose membership was smaller, had 24 members on their Executive Board.

Thirdly, the delegate of Norway had said there was nothing to prove that 18 was too small a membership since the Executive Board had so far discharged its duties very competently. It was, however, clear that it was difficult to ensure adequate representation of the various regions of the world with a membership of only 18 and that an increase in the membership would make it much easier. Moreover, while he agreed that the Executive Board had so far performed its work very well, he was convinced that it could have done even better with an increased membership. His delegation therefore strongly supported the joint proposal.

Dr. LORIA (Costa Rica) said he had the impression that the majority of the Committee was in favour of an increase in the membership of the Executive Board. His delegation, however, opposed such an increase and fully endorsed the views of the delegate of Norway. It was a purely arbitrary argument to say that the

number of members of the Executive Board should be one-third of the total membership of the Organization. The Executive Board should, a priori, be a small group which took action, resolved matters and discussed them in sufficient detail but which did not waste excessive time in broad general discussions. If its membership was increased, it would inevitably suffer from that defect. Moreover, the expenses of delegations would be increased since the increase in the number of members would lead to an increase in the length of discussions without any corresponding increase in the amount of work achieved. What concerned him most, however, was not the increase in expense but the delay in the work of the Executive Board which a larger membership would involve. In the second place, all countries were adequately represented in the Health Assembly and any country which particularly desired to designate a person to serve on the Executive Board would eventually have an opportunity of doing so. He therefore, supported the proposal of the delegate of Norway and opposed the joint proposal.

Ambassador HURTADO (Cuba) said that in his opinion the joint proposal was desirable since it would render its true power to the Executive Board. If there was not adequate numerical representation in the Board, it became a mere agent for the application of decisions instead of being able to exercise the power delegated to it.

The chief authority was the Health Assembly, which was an authentic representation of the conclave of Member States. All other international organizations except WHO had reorganized their Executive Boards, increasing their membership to approximately one-third of the total membership of the organization. It would, therefore, follow that one-third of the total membership provided an adequately balanced representation of the opinions of the whole organization.

It had been said that the Executive Board was an independent technical body, but that was merely a theoretical conception. It was rhetorical to speak of the Board's independence when governments enjoyed the right to replace those they had nominated to the Board, and the members of the Board were thus obviously dependent on their governments.

It was therefore highly desirable to increase the membership of the Board so as to provide for better geographical distribution of seats. He pointed out in that connexion that at the elections to the Executive Board held two days previously the European Region had lost one seat which had been gained by the Western Pacific Region.

His delegation therefore wholeheartedly supported the joint proposal and would vote in its favour. He did not believe that the Dominican Republic's proposal could be considered as an amendment to the joint proposal since it was totally different in substance.

The CHAIRMAN reminded delegates that at the discussion of the Assembly's timetable that morning, the possibility of night meetings had been broached, and urged delegates to limit the length of their statements so that the Committee might terminate its work as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. CIDOR (Israel) said his Government had instructed him to support the joint proposal without reservations. A similar development had been observed in other organizations, and since the Board was primarily a deliberative body there was no disadvantage in enlarging its membership.

Mr. de ERICE (Spain) said that in his opinion Rule 50 of the Rules of Procedure was perfectly clear as regards the possibility of introducing amendments, even of substance,

to any proposal. His delegation therefore supported the right of the Dominican Republic to submit its proposal as an amendment, and asked the Chairman for a ruling on the question.

Sir Arcot MUDALIAR (India) fully supported the stand taken by the delegate of Norway. Reference had frequently been made to the specialized agencies but he would deplore the day when WHO attempted to copy others.

Moreover, it was not absolutely true that membership of the Executive Board of other organizations had been increased because of the increase in the total membership of the organizations. In UNESCO, for example, the Executive Board had been increased from 18 to 20 but that increase was due to the decision to hold biennial instead of annual sessions of the Geneva Conference. He further pointed out that the membership of the United Nations Economic and Social Council had remained at 18.

It had been suggested that the small countries were not being properly represented on the Executive Board. He would point out that WHO was a truly democratic assembly of nations and that representation in it did not depend on any such considerations as size, wealth or population. He endorsed the views of the delegate of Costa Rica that a mere increase in members would not increase the value of the Executive Board's work. Moreover, if an initial decision were taken to increase the size of the Executive Board, it might be difficult to put a stop to further increases. Finally, he felt that economic and financial considerations would not justify an increase in the Board's membership. He therefore strongly supported the proposal of the delegate of Norway.

Mr. ZOHRAB (New Zealand) agreed that the composition of the Board should reflect as adequately as possible the membership of the Organization. He felt, however, that 18 was already a large number for an Executive Board and that the proposed increase would make it unwieldy. He therefore supported the proposal of the delegate of Norway.

Mr. BOUHAJEB (Tunisia) said that an increase in the membership of the Executive Board would not increase its prerogatives but would facilitate its work by giving closer liaison with a greater number of countries.

Dr. MARCEL (Viet-Nam) said his delegation fully supported the joint proposal for two reasons. In the first place, since the membership of the Organization and its business had increased and the Assembly's decisions were more numerous, it was logical that those who implemented the decisions should also be more numerous. Secondly, it had been proposed that a committee should be set up to make a preliminary examination of the budget before it was submitted to the Executive Board. He thought that such a committee might be composed of members belonging to the six Regional Committees. Such members might also be members of the Executive Board and there would thus be no need to call on members outside the Board to form the committee. Other committees might also be appointed by the Executive Board to study other questions. He therefore considered it desirable that the membership of the Executive Board should be increased from 18 to 24.

Mr. CALDERWOOD (United States of America) said some of the points he had been about to raise had already been made by other delegations.

His delegation was opposed to any change in the size of the Executive Board at that time. The amendment of the Constitution was a serious matter and should not be undertaken without due consideration. The proposal now before the Committee would affect the position of the Executive Board. Other proposals, which also affected the Executive Board had been considered at previous Health Assemblies. He believed that when the time came to increase the size of the Board such an increase should be considered in conjunction with the other proposals affecting its status. However, the only amendments which the present Health Assembly could consider at that stage were those designed to increase the size of the Board.

Arguments in favour of such an increase were based on considerations of equitable geographical distribution of seats and the adequate representation of the total membership of the Organization. He felt that equitable geographical distribution could be secured with the present number of members of the Board and, because it was precisely an Executive Board, its membership should not depend on the total number of Members in the Organization.

Two proposals had been made in 1950: one to change the status of the Executive Board to that of an inter-governmental body, and the other to hold biennial meetings. The second had been approved in principle, although action on the amendments necessary to give effect to it had been postponed to the Fifth and Sixth World Health Assemblies. The delegation of the Dominican Republic had now introduced a proposal similar to the joint proposal but with the proviso that no designating country would be immediately eligible for re-election. That proposal had not been circulated six months in advance of consideration as the Constitution required. Consequently, since the latter proposal had not been received in time, no amendment had been introduced to alter the status of the Executive Board to that of an inter-governmental body, and the question of biennial

meetings was not on the agenda, he felt that the Health Assembly should postpone any action on an increase in the size of the Executive Board until all four questions could be considered together.

An expansion in the Board's membership would increase the number of seats available for each geographical area. But while the proposal had only that merit, it had serious disadvantages. The Executive Board's essential function was to act as the executive arm of the Health Assembly and in order to achieve the best results it was composed of experts serving in their individual capacities. Any increase in the Board's membership would make its machinery more cumbersome and would prejudice the carrying out of its functions. Moreover, when the membership of the Board had been fixed at 18, that had been done without taking into consideration the total number of Members of the Organization; the only other proposals made at that time had been for a smaller membership for the Board.

An increase in the membership of the Board would, he felt, tend to carry the implication that it was a body on which governments were represented, but until a decision had been taken that the Board should become a representative as well as an executive body, the representation of individual countries was a function of the Health Assembly only. An increase in the Board's membership would also mean an increase in the Organization's expenses.

For all those reasons, his delegation supported the proposal of the delegate of Norway.

Professor CANAPERIA (Italy) said the delegate of Norway had recalled that morning that a proposal similar to the one before the Committee had been introduced by the delegation of Italy at the First World Health Assembly. When the first Executive Board had been elected, his delegation had been struck by the somewhat unusual procedure

followed, and reference to the letter from the delegation of Italy to the President of the First World Health Assembly would show that the aim of the proposal then submitted had merely been to ensure rotation among the countries called on to designate members to the Executive Board. He assured the Committee that the joint proposal now before it had the same aim. The number of countries in the Organization had increased considerably since 1948. It was true that the size of the Board was fixed without reference to the size of the Organization, but to have one of its nationals on the Board undoubtedly stimulated a country to take greater interest in the Organization's work. He wished to emphasize that the only aim of the joint proposal was to increase the size of membership of the Board and that there was no thought of changing its status.

Dr. GARCIA-OLDINI (Chile) said that according to the Constitution due account should be taken of equitable geographical distribution in selecting Members to designate a person to serve on the Executive Board. It was extremely difficult to do so without an increase in the Board's membership.

It had been said that an increase in the size of the Board would make its work more cumbersome. He felt, however, that it would, on the contrary facilitate the Board's work. The doubts and ambiguities which had appeared in some of the documents submitted to the Committee would be fewer since the increased membership would render the Board's work more expeditious and efficient.

It had been maintained that the Board was an executive body. While that was true, it was incomplete. The Board also had a co-legislative function. It formulated the programme and budget as well as ensuring the carrying out of the Health Assembly's decisions. That co-legislative aspect of its work would be greatly simplified by an increase in its membership.

Dr. Dia EL-CHATTI (Syria) moved closure of the debate under Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr. CORKERY (Australia) said his delegation wished to make certain observations, including some queries on points of order, and opposed closure until those points had been cleared up.

Dr. EVANG (Norway) opposed closure of the debate since he wished to have an opportunity of answering the statement made by the delegate of the United Kingdom.

The CHAIRMAN put the motion for closure to the vote.

Decision: The motion for closure was adopted by 41 votes to 12, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN said the Committee had before it the joint proposal of Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (document A7/2), the proposal made by the Dominican Republic (document A7/5) and that made by the delegate of Norway (document AFL/WP/7). The Committee also had before it the third report of the Legal Sub-Committee (document A7/AFL/26) on the question of the receivability of the Dominican Republic's proposal.

In accordance with Rule 60 of the Rules of Procedure he would put to the vote first the proposal of the delegate of Norway, which he deemed to be furthest removed in substance from the original proposal. If that proposal were adopted, there would be no need to vote on the others and he would therefore delay a ruling on the receivability of the Dominican Republic's proposal till the proposal of the delegate of Norway had been voted on. He reminded the Committee that under Article 73 of the Constitution any amendment to the Constitution required a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting for its adoption.

He put to the vote the proposal of the delegate of Norway.

Decision: The proposal of the delegate of Norway was rejected by 31 votes to 21 with 6 abstentions.

The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.20 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the report of the Legal Sub-Committee (document A7/AFL/26) dealing with the receivability of the Dominican Republic's proposal for amendment of the Constitution (document A7/5).

Decision: The report was adopted by 38 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN interpreted the vote as ruling out acceptance of the Dominican Republic proposal as an amendment to the proposals for amendment of the Constitution submitted by the Governments of Belgium, France, Italy and the United Kingdom (document A7/2).

Mr. CORKERY (Australia) contested the Chairman's interpretation. The finding of the Legal Sub-Committee that the Dominican Republic proposal was not receivable had been based on its status as an independent proposal for amendment of the Constitution. It had now been resubmitted as an amendment to the joint proposal. To declare it non-receivable might imply that amendments to proposals to amend the Constitution could not be considered unless they also had been circulated to governments six months in advance. Surely any receivable proposals for amendment of the Constitution were

open to amendment when considered in the Health Assembly. He accordingly asked the Chairman to put the question to the Committee.

Dr. van den BERG (Netherlands) regarded the proposal of the Government of the Dominican Republic indubitably as an independent proposal for amendment of the Constitution. Hence, not having been received within the stipulated time-limit, it was clearly not receivable. Moreover, as a proposal to change the status of the members of the Executive Board, it had plainly nothing to do with the joint proposal to enlarge the Board's membership. It could not, therefore, be accepted as an amendment to the joint proposal.

Mr. CALDERWOOD (United States of America), speaking as Rapporteur of the Legal Sub-Committee, stated that the Legal Sub-Committee had taken no decision on whether the proposal of the Government of the Dominican Republic could be reintroduced at the present session as an amendment to the joint proposals for amendment of the Constitution now before the Committee.

His delegation found it unacceptable as such - even if the sponsors of the joint proposals should be inclined to accept it - as it was not directly related to those proposals. He disagreed with the contention of the delegate of Australia that, if the proposal of the Government of the Dominican Republic was rejected as an amendment, no other amendments to the joint proposals could be introduced. It was open to any delegation to propose an amendment to those proposals, provided it was relevant.

Decision: The Committee decided, by 32 votes to 16, with 9 abstentions, that the proposal of the Government of the Dominican Republic (A7/5) was not receivable as an amendment to the joint proposals for amendment of the Constitution (A7/2).

Passing to the joint proposal (document A7/2), the CHAIRMAN noted that the texts submitted by the four governments were not in exact conformity, and asked whether one of them was generally acceptable.

Mr. BOUCHER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) stated that the delegates of the four countries concerned had agreed to accept the United Kingdom text as representing their views.

Dr. SALGADO (Haiti) asked for a separate vote on the two amendments to the Constitution entailed by the proposal.

Dr. EVANG (Norway) pointed out that the two amendments were closely inter-related and hence could not be voted upon separately.

Dr. SALGADO (Haiti) accordingly agreed to withdraw his proposal.

The CHAIRMAN put the joint proposal for amendment of the Constitution (document A7/2) to the vote.

The result of the voting was as follows:

Number of members present and voting: 53

Requisite two-thirds majority: 35.33

In favour: 34

Against: 19

Abstaining: 5

The joint proposal, not having received the required two-thirds majority, was rejected.

Dr. Dia' EL-CHATTI (Syria) asked for a recount because of the possibility of error.

Mr. PROSPERI (Italy) supported the proposal. In view of the narrow margin by which the proposal had been rejected, it would be better, too, to have a roll-call vote.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with Rule 62 of the Rules of Procedure, a motion to reconsider a question required a two-thirds majority for adoption.

In answer to a point raised by the delegate of Chile, he pointed out that, under Article 60 (c) of the Constitution, the two-thirds majority rule on amendments to the Constitution was also applicable to the voting in the Committee.

He then put to the vote the motion to reopen the question.

The result of the voting was as follows:

Number of members present and voting: 57

Requisite two-thirds majority: 38

In favour: 34

Against: 23

The motion, not having received the required two-thirds majority, was rejected.

2. DRAFT SECOND REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION, FINANCE AND LEGAL MATTERS TO THE COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMME AND BUDGET (Document A7/AFL/33)

Mr. SØRENSEN (Denmark), Rapporteur, introduced the report, pointing out two minor corrections in the text.

Decision: The report was unanimously adopted, as amended.

3. CONSIDERATION OF A SYSTEM OF COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS: Item 7.29 of the Agenda (Official Records No. 48, Resolution WHA6.53; Official Records No. 52, Resolution EBL3.R66; Document A7/AFL/12)

There being no observations on the item, the CHAIRMAN directed attention to the draft resolution submitted in document A7/AFL/12.

Decision: The draft resolution was unanimously adopted.

4. UNITED NATIONS JOINT STAFF PENSION FUND: Item 7.31 of the Agenda; WHO STAFF PENSION COMMITTEE: APPOINTMENTS OF REPRESENTATIVES TO REPLACE MEMBERS WHOSE PERIOD OF MEMBERSHIP EXPIRES: Item 7.31.1 of the Agenda (Official Records No. 35, Resolution WHA4.63; Document A7/AFL/8)

Mr. BRADY (Ireland) suggested that the Committee should consider the nomination to the Pension Committee of the members of the Executive Board designated by the Union of South Africa and, as alternate, of the member designated by Japan. That would, he believed, maintain the requisite geographical distribution in the Pension Committee.

Decision:

(1) The Committee unanimously approved the nominations put forward by the delegate of Ireland.

(2) It unanimously adopted the draft resolution set out in document A7/AFL/8, with the insertion of the appropriate names.

5. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS JOINT STAFF PENSION BOARD FOR 1952: Item 7.31.2 of the Agenda (Document A7/AFL/9)

Decision: The Committee adopted the draft resolution set out on page 1 of the report (Document A7/AFL/9) without comment.

6. ACCOMMODATION FOR THE HEADQUARTERS OFFICE: REPORT ON THE COST OF THE NEW BUILDING AND ON MEASURES TAKEN PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION WHA6.36: Item 7.32 of the Agenda (Official Records No. 48, Resolution WHA6.36; Official Records No. 52, Resolution EB13.R69 and Annex 18)

The CHAIRMAN directed attention to the draft resolution on the subject submitted by the Executive Board (Official Records No. 52, page 28).

Mr. AMERASEKERA (Ceylon) proposed the addition of a fifth paragraph to the draft resolution reading as follows:

"OFFERS its thanks to the Government of Switzerland for the contribution made to the costs involved."

Decision: The draft resolution, as amended, was unanimously adopted.

7. REPORT ON CO-ORDINATION WITH THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL QUESTIONS: Item 7.33 of the Agenda (Document A7/P&B/7, pp. 27-41)

Mr. SOLE (Union of South Africa), recalling that the United Nations Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions undertook each year an examination of the budgets of the various specialized agencies, thereafter submitting a report to the United Nations for comment and information, said that his Government regarded that report as of the utmost value both to the specialized agencies and to the United Nations itself.

The report was generally considered by the Executive Board at its January session. He would like to see the Executive Board comment in its report on the criticisms and observations made in respect of the World Health Organization.

The Advisory Committee had commented on the Executive Board's decision taken in June 1952 to establish the whole Board as the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance. That decision had given rise to some legitimate criticism in the course of the present Health Assembly, and the Advisory Committee, in drawing attention to the matter, had implied criticism. It was on issues such as that that the Executive Board should transmit its comments to the Health Assembly. He had no formal proposal to make on the matter, but considered the point worthy of raising.

Mr. SIEGEL (Assistant Director-General, Administration and Finance), Secretary, informed the Committee that the Advisory Committee's reports were made available to the Executive Board at its first session of each year. If the Committee so wished, the Secretariat could bring the observations just made to the attention of the Executive Board, so that it could include some specific comments in its reports.

Mr. SOLE (Union of South Africa) agreed that that would meet his wishes.

Decision: The Committee unanimously adopted the following draft resolution:

"The Seventh World Health Assembly,

NOTES the report of the Director-General on co-ordination with the United Nations and specialized agencies on administrative and financial matters."

8. FORM AND PRESENTATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAMME AND BUDGET ESTIMATES
Item 7.6 of the Agenda (Official Records No. 52, Resolution EB13.R55
and Annex 15; Documents A7/AFL/25 and A7/AFL/28)

The CHAIRMAN called attention to the resolution and recommendations of the Executive Board on the future form of presentation of the annual programme and

budget estimates (resolution EBl3.R55 and Official Records No. 52, Annex 15).

The Committee also had before it a draft resolution proposed by the delegation of Lebanon (document A7/AFL/25) and a note by the Director-General (document A7/AFL/28).

Dr. HYDE, Representative of the Executive Board, said the Board recognized that, in the early stages of development, it had been necessary for a proper understanding of the programme and budget that the Executive Board and Governments should have sufficiently detailed information. It had, however, been somewhat concerned at the bulky volume presented to it for 1955, and, while not wishing to sacrifice any of the essential information, it yet felt that some changes in presentation might be possible so as to effect economies and to remove duplication.

The Board felt particularly strongly that a clear distinction should be drawn between the estimates relating to the regular budget and those relating to Technical Assistance and other extra-budgetary funds. It also questioned the need to include in the country schedules, for purposes of comparison, data covering the two years preceding the year under review.

There was no need, he thought, to go into the Board's suggestions in detail; they were set out in Annex 15 to the report of its thirteenth session and the Director-General, after further analysis and study, had submitted amendments to the proposals.

The SECRETARY said that, as the representative of the Executive Board had explained, the study carried out on the form of the annual programme and budget estimates seemed to indicate that the budget document could be substantially reduced in size by the elimination of certain material, while still containing sufficient

information to enable the Executive Board and the Health Assembly to make a careful appraisal of proposals for the ensuing year.

The Director-General had made one recommendation not in conformity with the Executive Board's proposals (document A7/AFL/28), to the effect that the country schedules should show, side by side with the totals for the year under review, the corresponding totals in respect of the activities included in the programmes for the two preceding years.

If the Committee agreed with that proposal it would wish to make the necessary changes in the draft resolution submitted by the Executive Board (Official Records No. 52, pages 22 and 23). By changing its draft resolution (document A7/AFL/25) to apply to future years generally instead of to 1956 only, the proposal of the delegation of Lebanon could be included as an additional operative paragraph to the draft resolution submitted by the Executive Board.

Dr. EVANG (Norway) asked the delegate of Lebanon also to consider changing the words "regular activities of the Organization" in his draft resolution. The terms "regular budget" and "extra-budgetary funds" were in general usage. He felt, however, that all activities were regular activities under the Constitution. He was not objecting to the substance of the proposal and suggested that it might be left to the Rapporteur to make the necessary change.

Dr. BAUJI (Lebanon) accepted both suggestions made by the two previous speakers.

Mr. SOLE (Union of South Africa) wondered whether it would be feasible, within the time available, to circulate the Director-General's draft programme and budget for each year to the Executive Board in mimeographed form; after final approval by

the Board, it might then be issued for the first time in printed form, instead of continuing the existing practice of printing the volume before submission to the Executive Board. That procedure, it seemed to him, made it a little difficult, psychologically, for the Board to make radical changes during its consideration.

Dr. HYDE, representative of the Executive Board, pointed out that, under Article 55 of the Constitution, the Board did not approve or disapprove the Director-General's annual programme and budget estimates; its function was merely to study and comment upon them.

Mr. CORKERY (Australia) asked for further discussion on the item to be postponed until the following meeting, in order to give him further time to study a proposal which had been submitted by the delegation of the Netherlands (document A7/AFL/34).

It was so agreed.

9. REPORT ON THE SITUATION REGARDING THE REGIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN; Item 7.9 of the Agenda (Official Records No. 48, Resolution WHA6.47, Official Records No. 52, Resolution EB13.R45 and Annex 14; Documents A7/AFL/22, A7/AFL/35)

Sir Arcot MUDALIAR (India), Chairman of the Working Party on Meetings of the Regional Committee for the Eastern Mediterranean, introduced the Working Party's report, which had received the unanimous approval of its members.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Working Party for the admirable spirit in which it had tackled such an arduous task. It would be discussed at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.