



WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTÉ

A23/B/SR/11 Corr.1

22 May 1970

ENGLISH ONLY

TWENTY-THIRD WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE B

COMMITTEE B

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING

CORRIGENDUM

Page 11, last two paragraphs

delete and insert:

The CHAIRMAN, noting that there were no comments, invited the Committee to approve the draft resolution in document A23/AFL/16 Add.1, paragraph 7.

Decision: The draft resolution was approved.



TWENTY-THIRD WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE B

COMMITTEE B

INDEXED

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING

Palais des Nations, Geneva
Monday, 18 May 1970, at 9.00 a.m.

CHAIRMAN: Dr C. K. HASAN (Pakistan)



CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Draft fifth report of Committee B	2
2. Consideration of the desirability and feasibility of the establishment of a group of representatives of Member States to consult with the External Auditor on his examination of the financial and administrative procedures of WHO	2
3. Members in arrears in the payment of their contributions to an extent which may invoke Article 7 of the Constitution	10

Note: Corrections to this provisional summary record should reach the Chief, Editorial Services, World Health Organization, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland, before 3 July 1970.

1. DRAFT FIFTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (Document A23/B/6)

Dr KOUROUMA (Guinea), Rapporteur, read out the draft fifth report of the Committee.

Decision: The draft report was adopted.

2. CONSIDERATION OF THE DESIRABILITY AND FEASIBILITY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A GROUP OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MEMBER STATES TO CONSULT WITH THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR ON HIS EXAMINATION OF THE FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES OF WHO: Item 3.13 of the Agenda (Resolutions WHA22.4, EB44.R20 and EB45.R14; Official Records No. 181, Annex 10)

Dr VENEDIKTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked why the Committee was starting with the last item on its programme for the day.

Mr SIEGEL, Assistant Director-General, expressed his regret at the change in the order of the items but explained that the External Auditor had returned to Geneva especially to assist the Committee and the Secretariat when item 3.13 was discussed. It would also be recalled that the Committee had decided at its third meeting to take up item 3.9.3 - Members in arrears in the payment of their contributions to an extent which may invoke Article 7 of the Constitution - on 18 May 1970.

There being no further comment, the CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the Executive Board to introduce the subject.

Dr JURICIC, representative of the Executive Board, recalled that the Twenty-second World Health Assembly, in its resolution WHA22.4 had requested the Executive Board to consider the desirability and feasibility of establishing a group of representatives of Member States to consult with the External Auditor on his examination of the financial and administrative procedures of WHO, and to submit a report thereon to the Twenty-third World Health Assembly together with its recommendations. The question had been discussed at the forty-fifth session of the Board which, on the basis of a report by the Director-General and a memorandum by the External Auditor (Official Records No. 181, pages 163-164 and 164-166), had come to the conclusion that the suggested arrangement was not compatible with the professional requirements of the External Auditor and the maintenance of independence in his responsibility solely to the World Health Assembly. The Executive Board had recommended, in resolution EB45.R14 a draft resolution to that effect, for consideration by the Twenty-third World Health Assembly.

Speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Mr Lars BREIE, External Auditor, recalled that he had been present at the meeting, in January 1970, when the Executive Board considered the resolution to which the Board's representative had just referred and that he had presented to the Board the memorandum in which he had explained his views on the duties of the External Auditor.

He had also raised the subject at the twelfth regular session of the Panel of External Auditors, which had met in Vienna from 22-24 April 1970. The Panel had been provided with complete documentation concerning resolution WHA22.4, including relevant passages of the summary records of the Executive Board and his own memorandum, since he wished to have his colleagues' views on that very important matter.

The minutes of the Panel meeting had not yet been made final but he could inform the Committee that the members of the Panel fully supported the views expressed in the memorandum. The minutes of the Panel meeting would shortly be distributed to the organizations of the United Nations system, including WHO.

For the Committee's information, the Panel of External Auditors was composed of the members of the United Nations Board of Auditors and the External Auditors of all the specialized agencies. The purpose of the Panel was, inter alia, "to further the coordination of the audits for which its members are responsible and to exchange information on methods and findings".

His view was that the External Auditor's main task was to audit the accounts for accuracy and regularity with a view to certifying them. That was, and always had been, his basic duty. His second task was to comment on the matters listed in Section 5 of the Principles to Govern the Audit Procedures of the World Health Organization appended to the Financial Regulations (Basic Documents, page 80).

It was clearly stated, in those Principles, that it was for the External Auditor to decide on the extent as well as the method of audit and that it was also for him to decide what observations he should make in the field of financial management. The External Auditor had authority to comment on any matter concerning administrative efficiency. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) had interpreted the situation as follows:

"the Committee considers that observations on the administrative and management areas should be incidental to the financial audit" (UN document supplement No. 8 (A/7608)).

He drew the Committee's attention to another ACABQ report which stated:

"In particular, the Committee believes that in initiating a number of special, separate management audits the Board may have gone further than the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts intended when it recommended that the external auditors be enabled to make observations on administration and management. The Committee would interpret this recommendation to mean that if, in the course of its regular audits, the Board encountered aspects of administration and management which it considered might be improved, in the interest of the organization concerned, it should include appropriate observations in its reports." (UN document supplement No. 7 (A/7607)).

In his capacity as External Auditor of the International Labour Organisation also he wished to quote from the report of the Financial and Administrative Committee of ILO, concerning the 1968 accounts:

"The Committee took note of the audited accounts for the 50th financial period (1968) and of the Auditor's reports thereon.

The United States Government member stressed the desirability of having the Auditor include in his reports any comments that he might consider to be appropriate on administrative and management problems encountered during the course of his work.

Lord Collison, on behalf of the Worker members, took the view that administrative and management problems were not a matter for the Auditor, whose job was to deal with the accounts.

The Committee proposed to the Governing Body that it recommend to the Conference to adopt the audited accounts for 1968."

It was apparent from the above quotations that opinions differed within the United Nations system of organizations on the extent to which the External Auditor should examine administration and management.

Dr VENEDIKTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had the greatest respect for the Executive Board and for the External Auditor, the importance and usefulness of whose services to the Organization were beyond dispute. His delegation, however, was not fully satisfied with the Executive Board's decision on the matter under discussion. It seemed that at the Twenty-second World Health Assembly it had not succeeded in explaining the reasons for the draft resolution it had presented and in making out a convincing case for the measure it had proposed.

The point was that WHO needed what might be termed a cost/benefit evaluation of its work, covering both the operating programme and administrative and financial procedures. Certainly, as the delegate of Norway had said, it was difficult to evaluate WHO's programme, but he still thought that careful attention should be given to the problem. The present Health Assembly had already adopted a resolution (WHA23.5) requesting the External Auditor to present more detailed comments on the management and administration of WHO. His delegation wished to receive comments on a whole series of matters connected with WHO's work. In one of its reports the Joint Inspection Unit had made interesting observations on WHO's assistance to developing countries - but comments on the internal workings of WHO were needed from some body set up by the Organization itself, not from external sources.

His delegation's proposal at the Twenty-second World Health Assembly had been an attempt to ascertain how a more detailed analysis of the Organization's financial and administrative procedures could be obtained. He did not quite understand why the establishment of a group of representatives of Member States to help the External Auditor would be so difficult, and was not convinced that it would be in conflict with the Constitution and with United Nations practice. He had listened with great attention to the remarks of the External Auditor concerning ILO; WHO's programme and structure, however, were very different from those of ILO.

His delegation would not bring forward any proposals concerning the draft resolution presented by the Executive Board in its resolution EB45.R14 at the present stage, since it first wished to hear the comments of other delegations.

Mr SIEGEL, Assistant Director-General, said that it might be useful for the Committee to bear in mind that the subject before it concerned solely the role of the External Auditor. The delegation of the Soviet Union had introduced a number of subjects which the Health Assembly would have an opportunity of discussing under other agenda items. The Director-General wished the Health Assembly to be completely satisfied that it had adequate reports on the activities of the Organization but that was a matter substantially different from the subject under discussion - namely, the extent to which the External Auditor's functions should continue to be governed by the Financial Regulations and the Appendix thereto. If it should be the wish of the Committee to have a study carried out on organizational structure and administrative efficiency, for example, he would invite members' attention to the Director-General's report to the Executive Board, at its forty-fifth session on the selection of a subject for the future organizational study to be made by the Executive Board (document EB45/19), and particularly to paragraph 4.1 which read:

One subject which might be studied by the Executive Board is "Organizational structure and administrative efficiency". The Board will recall that it considered the matter in full in 1950 and 1951; no comprehensive study of a similar nature has since been made, although some parts of the question are normally examined during the review of the annual proposed programme and budget estimates by the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance and the Executive Board.

In the following paragraph, the Director-General had suggested another subject: "Medical literature services to Members" which, on the Board's advice, the Committee had just recommended to the Health Assembly in its fifth report.

Accordingly, he suggested that the Organization already possessed the machinery which could be used to request the Executive Board, in a future year, to conduct an organizational study of organizational structure, including administrative efficiency if that were the wish of the Health Assembly.

Professor AUJALEU (France) expressed understanding of the Soviet delegations wish to find means of evaluating more closely the financial activities of the Organization. He could not agree with them, however, on the procedure.

As could be seen from the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board, it was essential that the External Auditor should have full responsibility and, therefore, complete independence. There was a risk that any group established to advise him would reduce his independence, and so his responsibility.

The composition of a group consisting of representatives of Member States would immediately give rise to difficulties, as had been mentioned at the Twenty-second World Health Assembly. Factors such as geographical distribution and the need for a balance as between the large and small contributors, and developed and developing countries would have to be taken into account.

As the Executive Board already had power to establish working groups, it would be unnecessary to provide for any new machinery of the kind advocated by the delegate of the USSR. Although the members of working groups of the Board did not represent Member States, they could be expected to know their views.

For those reasons his delegation would support the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board.

Dr EHRlich (United States of America) shared the views of the delegate of France. He also agreed that more information should be supplied by the Secretariat and the External Auditor in order to enable governments to reach informed decisions. However, the Executive Board member designated by the United States of America, at the forty-fifth session, and his own delegation at the present Assembly considered that the proposed group of representatives of States was not the proper mechanism for obtaining the necessary information. His delegation would continue to seek a suitable mechanism. The Assistant Director-General had described one procedure. There might be others.

Professor HALTER (Belgium) said that he shared the views of the delegates of France and the United States of America.

It might be possible, by special study and research, to introduce improvements in order to enable Member States to follow the financial activities of the Organization more easily and understand them better. But the audit itself was a special responsibility which could not be shared with a group of representatives of Member States. If the responsibility were to be shared at all, every Member State would wish to take its part.

For those reasons, in the absence of a change in the structure of the documentation and information presented - which might be made, but if it were it should be made later - his delegation considered that the Committee should maintain its trust in the appointed Auditor and approve the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board.

Sir George GODBER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that he fully agreed with the delegate of France that the Committee should not contemplate attaching a working group of Member States to the External Auditor. The idea had been discussed at the Twenty-second World Health Assembly and at the forty-fifth session of the Executive Board, and had been rejected. However, he saw no reason why there should not be some machinery within the Executive Board to ensure that Member States were able to inform themselves fully of the considerations just raised by the delegate of the Soviet Union.

His delegation supported the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board.

Mr PIACITELLI (Italy) said that it was a fundamental principle that the External Auditor should be completely independent and free to make any comments that seemed to him necessary. To place alongside him a working group of government representatives would permit pressure to be brought to bear on him to act or express opinions otherwise than in conformity with normal procedures. His delegation would therefore support the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board.

Dr VENEDIKTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the delegates for their comments and for their understanding of the motives and reasons behind the proposal of his delegation.

There were certainly a number of ways in which the object of examining the financial and administrative procedures of the Organization could be achieved and some thought should be given to the matter, especially since - if he had rightly understood the Assistant Director-General - it had not been considered since 1951. However, in the light of the discussion, he would not propose amendments to the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board, although he would abstain from the vote on it.

Dr KOUROUMA (Guinea) said that the comments had shown, on the one hand the need for clear and continuous information on the financial activities of WHO and, on the other hand, fear of instituting cumbersome administrative machinery and diminishing the independence of the External Auditor.

Following the interventions he had just heard, he felt obliged to say that, in his opinion, it would not be beyond the ingenuity of the Executive Board to evolve a machinery which would help provide Member States with information on WHO financial activities, which were the province of the External Auditor. He considered that no concessions should be made on those grounds, since it was essential that Member States should understand the Organization's financial operations. At the same time, the difficulties concerning the powers and membership of the proposed group were such that he would be obliged to abstain in any vote. Indeed, he wondered what positive results could emerge from a vote, since achievement of a majority was not necessarily an indication that the motion thus adopted would make for maximum efficiency. That might well be the case with the draft resolution before the Committee.

While he did not wish his remarks to be taken personally, it would be perfectly possible for the External Auditor in the discharge of his duties to be fully independent of the Organization and its Member States, as such, while being open to pressure from other quarters, with harmful results to the work of the Organization. In the difficulty of reconciling the functional independence of the External Auditor with the need for Member States to be fully informed, he doubted whether a vote would bring the best solution.

Dr STREET (Jamaica) said that having taken part in the discussion in the Executive Board, desirous of respecting the independence of the External Auditor, and noting that the Director-General was creating an opportunity for an intensive study of administrative and financial efficiency to be made in the near future, his delegation was in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board and would vote in favour of it.

Mr PIACITELLI (Italy) explained that the first step in improving the information available to Member States would be to ensure that they received the annual Financial Report and Report of the External Auditor in time to give it due attention before the Health Assembly.

The functions which it was proposed to give to a governmental working group were, in fact, those of the Health Assembly itself which should make comments and criticisms on the Organization's financial management. All the observations made during the Health Assembly would be taken into account by the Secretariat and the External Auditor and should be sufficient to enable the External Auditor to discharge his duties in the best interests of the Member States and of the Organization.

Dr NCHINDA (Cameroon) said that there was no doubt that a study of the cost/benefit relationship of WHO activities and expenditures would be valuable. His delegation therefore welcomed the suggestion that it would be possible to have a body set up to make a study of that kind of evaluation. Meanwhile it was important to leave the External Auditor his independence. To establish a governmental working group, as proposed by the delegation of the USSR, would lay the External Auditor open to pressure, and his report would lose its objectivity. Moreover, it would be difficult to find an acceptable formula for the membership of any such group. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board.

Dr SAI (Ghana) assured the Soviet delegation of his delegation's sympathy with the need for periodic or continuing study of the Organization's administrative and financial practices. However, it would not be correct to try to bring together in a single group two functions which should be separate: audit of the accounts and making of comments on matters affecting the financial and administrative management of the Organization; and the Organization's assessment of its own operations, in relation to the attainment of its objectives and the machinery which it had, or could have, to attain them. It would be for the Executive Board to take the appropriate action now that it knew the feeling of the Health Assembly.

Mr FINDLAY (Sierra Leone) recalled that at the Twenty-second Health Assembly, his delegation had supported the request to the Executive Board to explore the desirability and feasibility of establishing a group to consult with the External Auditor (resolution WHA22.4). However, as the establishment of such a group would not be in accordance with the present provisions of the Financial Regulations and of the Principles to Govern the Audit Procedures of the World Health Organization, his delegation now withdrew that support and would vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board.

Dr AL-WAHBI (Iraq) expressed his full agreement with the delegate of Ghana on the need to separate the two functions, as explained. He recalled that, many years previously, a member of the Executive Board, designated by Japan, had proposed the establishment of a group of health administrators, economists and others to study the possibility of evaluating and assessing the efficiency of the Organization's work from the administrative, economic and other points of view. Unfortunately the proposal had not been taken up, perhaps because it was felt that the time was not ripe for such a study.

The proposal of the delegation of the USSR had its merits and so perhaps it would be possible to ask the Director-General to study and report on the possibility of setting up a group of experts to study the economic and administrative position of the Organization and make suggestions, independently, to the Executive Board.

Dr ALAN (Turkey) said that he shared the views expressed by the delegate of France. He also agreed with what had been said by the delegates of Belgium and the United States of America on the desirability of finding other means of enabling Member States to study the Organization's administrative and financial management.

Noting that there was a body of opinion in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board, he added that he shared the misgivings of the delegate of Guinea in regard to voting as a means of reaching the best conclusion.

As for the suggestion by the delegate of Iraq to set up a group of experts, he hoped that the financial implications would be carefully considered before such a group were created.

Dr DOLGOR (Mongolia) said there could be no doubt about the need for a group to evaluate the Organization's programme and its administrative structure and efficiency, although he agreed that it should be entirely independent of the External Auditor's work. Perhaps it might be a permanent body of the Executive Board, rather like the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance, which, ideally, would meet immediately before the Health Assembly when the Financial Report would be available. Certain topics, and units or divisions of the Organization, might also be selected for review by the group, which could then submit a report on its findings to the Health Assembly. Another solution might be to set up a group of experts as suggested by the delegate of Iraq.

He recalled that, during the discussion of the matter at the Twenty-second World Health Assembly, the Assistant Director-General had said that it would cost approximately \$ 10 000 to set up a group. In view of the resources available for expert groups, however, he did not think it would be difficult to find the money, and therefore agreed that the Director-General should be asked to look into the possibilities.

He regretted that no definite proposal for the setting-up of some sort of group had been advanced since, if the draft resolution in the Board's resolution EB45.R14 were adopted, the matter would no doubt be brought up again.

Mr SIEGEL, Assistant Director-General, pointed out that the comment he had made at the Twenty-second Health Assembly, and to which the Mongolian delegate had referred, had been within the context of a discussion on the meaning of management audit, in which connexion he had mentioned that the External Auditor would require an estimated additional US\$ 10 000. He had not been referring to the proposed expert committee, for which the Secretariat was in any event unable to calculate the costs owing to lack of precise information - for example, as to the composition of the group.

The item under discussion related solely to the function of the External Auditor: the questions of management audit and organizational studies had already been considered, and resolutions passed thereon. Some of the comments made during the meeting, therefore, seemed to indicate that a procedural vote might be needed to decide whether or not to re-open the debate on certain items. He suggested that the Committee might create difficulties for itself by introducing into the discussion subjects that had already been, or would be, dealt with under other agenda items.

Dr KOUROUMA (Guinea) said that the term "small" country, which he had heard during the discussion, was relative, since the size of a country was not to be measured solely by the number of its population or the extent of its resources. A prime example was Switzerland, the seat of so many international organizations and, in his view, a great country.

Stressing the need for the Health Assembly to have a clear view of the matter under consideration, he noted that Article XII of the Financial Regulations, relating to External Audit, referred throughout to the "External Auditor(s)" rather than to the External Auditor in the singular only. That seemed to indicate that the authors of the text had been aware of the need for collective responsibility in the matter, and had sought, without in any way implying lack of confidence in the External Auditor, to provide for a safeguard.

There had been references during the discussion to difficulties in setting up some appropriate form of machinery - but similar difficulties had already been encountered in respect of the Executive Board which had nonetheless been set up and was now serving the Organization. There were only too many instances throughout the world of laws being made, and not observed, but it was the Committee's duty to face up to difficulties, not to avoid them.

Lastly, he expressed serious concern at the way in which whenever a subject of particular interest to the so-called "small countries" arose, they were immediately threatened with the vote and the crushing majority that seemed to indicate a decision to the satisfaction of all. He, however, was not content with the existing arrangements and favoured the idea of a group of experts - or any other step that would give the Health Assembly a clearer view of matters. The External Auditor had his full confidence, but confidence did not preclude control. No matter what the results of the vote, he would oppose solely individual responsibility in the matter under consideration.

Sir George GODBER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that possibly the suggestion of the delegate of Mongolia might provide the Committee with a way out of its difficulty. He himself however had had in mind to suggest that a sentence be added to the second operative paragraph of the draft resolution the Board had proposed for the Health Assembly's consideration: it would be to the effect that the Health Assembly requested the Board, at its forty-seventh session, to consider alternative methods of establishing machinery for a continuing review of the administrative procedures and the execution of the WHO programme by a committee of the Board. It was however perhaps not apposite in that resolution. If so, and if the Committee agreed to something of the kind, the Assistant Director-General could perhaps say how it might be dealt with.

Mr SIEGEL, Assistant Director-General, said the purpose of his previous statement had not been to prevent members from expressing their views, but rather to suggest that they confine themselves to the subject matter applicable under the item. A number of unrelated points had been introduced under the present item which concerned solely external audit and the role of the External Auditor. One possible course of action, since the Committee were pressed for time, might be to ask the Board's representative to call attention, in his report to the Board's forty-sixth session, to the summary record of the discussion. The Board could then decide, as it saw fit, on the procedure to adopt.

Dr OLGUÍN (Argentina) said the External Auditor's functions and responsibilities were questions of prime importance, and had already been discussed by the Health Assembly and Board on previous occasions. In his delegation's view, it was essential to evaluate the Organization's activities and methods of procedure with a view to determining possibilities for improvement. He considered however that the Organization already had all the necessary elements for carrying out such a critical appreciation, together with the active participation of the members of the Health Assembly and Board and was therefore opposed to any further addition to the large number of bodies already existing. Moreover, the Health Assembly should be able to judge the activities of the External Auditor - who was a member of a group responsible to the United Nations - on the basis of the reports he submitted. In view of all the comments made and of the information furnished both by the Secretariat and in Official Records No. 181, his delegation considered that the Committee should proceed to a decision on resolution EB45.R14 and on the suggestions made in the course of the debate.

Lastly, he expressed his delegation's support for resolution EB45.R14 and formally moved the closure of the debate.

The SECRETARY read out Rule 61 of the Rules of Procedure, according to which two members could speak against the motion for closure of the debate before it was put to the vote.

Dr VENEDIKTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking against the motion, said that, as the discussion was almost at an end and the Committee on the point of reaching a consensus, he did not think the debate should be closed. He suggested that members be invited to state their views as briefly as possible. If it were agreed to continue the discussion, he would propose a compromise solution.

Dr AL-WAHBI (Iraq), speaking against the motion, urged the need for a full discussion of such an important matter: If the Committee agreed to the suggestion that the summary record of the discussion be transmitted to the Board, all members should have time to express their views.

The CHAIRMAN put the proposal to close the debate to the vote.

Decision: The proposal was adopted by 46 votes to 13, with 20 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then invited attention to the draft resolution recommended for adoption in resolution EB45.R14.

Dr VENEDIKTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that he had understood that proposals had been made by the delegates of Mongolia and the United Kingdom. Were they to be put to the vote or not?

The CHAIRMAN asked those delegates to indicate whether they had in fact submitted formal amendments.

Sir George GODBER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that he had not.

Dr DOLGOR (Mongolia) said that he had not made a formal proposal either and therefore agreed with the suggestion of the Assistant Director-General that the summary records of the discussion be transmitted to the Board at its forty-sixth session.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Executive Board in resolution EB45.R14.

Decision: The draft resolution was approved by 62 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

Mr SIEGEL, Assistant Director-General, then assured the Committee that, in view of the statements made during the discussion, the Director-General would consult with the representative of the Executive Board and would place the summary records of the discussion before the Board at its forty-sixth session immediately after the close of the Health Assembly.

3. MEMBERS IN ARREARS IN THE PAYMENT OF THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO AN EXTENT WHICH MAY INVOKE ARTICLE 7 OF THE CONSTITUTION: Item 3.9.3 of the Agenda (Resolutions WHA8.13, paragraph 2, WHA16.20, part II, paragraphs 2 and 4, EB45.R25; Official Records No. 181, Annex 3; Documents A23/AFL/16 and Corr.1, A23/AFL/16 Add.1) (continued)

Mr SIEGEL, Assistant Director-General, said that document A23/AFL/16 Add.1, to be considered under the item, had through an oversight not been mentioned in the Journal. He apologized for that omission.

Dr VENEDIKTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not understand why the Committee was taking the items on the day's agenda in reverse order, especially since delegations had not received document A23/AFL/16 Add.1. He suggested that it would be better to discuss the items in the order listed in the Journal and thus allow time for the document in question to be distributed.

Mr SIEGEL, Assistant Director-General, said that he had explained earlier why it had been necessary to deal first with items 3.13 and 3.9.3 of the agenda. In any event, the Journal was not an official document of the Health Assembly but was issued for information purposes

only, though he regretted the omission therein. Document A23/AFL/16 Add.1 merely contained certain information which the Committee had asked to have by 18 May 1970. The Secretariat would be quite willing to postpone the discussion thereon, however, if that were the Committee's wish.

Dr VENEDIKTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had always understood that the Journal was issued to enable delegates to know when and where particular items were to come up for discussion and that, unless there were special reasons, items were always dealt with in the order given therein. He knew that certain delegations had particularly wished to keep to the order in the Journal. He had no personal objection to discussing item 3.9.3 at that point - provided he received the relevant document - but he did not think that the proper procedure was being observed.

Dr AL-WAHBI (Iraq) agreed that the Journal was not an official document but pointed out that, at the previous meeting, the Secretary had read out the items to be discussed in the same order as listed in the Journal.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the Secretary had also mentioned that, if the External Auditor were available, the meeting would deal first with item 3.13.

Professor HALTER (Belgium), agreeing with the Soviet delegate, said his delegation was concerned in two draft resolutions, both of which he had expected to be dealt with that morning, one in Committee A and the other in Committee B. He had missed the discussion on the first, while awaiting, in vain, for the discussion on the second.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to decide whether or not it wished to discuss item 3.9.3 at that point.

Sir George GODBER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) proposed that it do so forthwith.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any proposal to the contrary, he assumed that the Committee wished to proceed with the item.

He invited the Assistant Director-General to introduce the item.

Mr SIEGEL, Assistant Director-General, said document A23/AFL/16 Add.1 contained the Director-General's report on developments which had occurred since the Committee's discussion on the item the previous week. As stated therein, payment for 1968 had been received from Uruguay, which was therefore no longer in arrears to an extent which might invoke the provisions of Article 7 of the Constitution.

The Director-General had sent cables to the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Paraguay, the reply received from the Dominican Republic being reproduced as Annex I to the document. In view of the assurances given by the Permanent Representative of the Dominican Republic, the Director-General intended to pursue the matter with that Member. The Director-General had also received a cable from Haiti, which appeared in Annex II of the document. No reply had been received from Paraguay. Since neither Haiti nor Paraguay were present at the Health Assembly the question of voting rights did not arise.

Lastly, he drew attention to paragraph 7 of document A23/AFL/16 Add.1 which contained a suggested form of draft resolution for the Committee's consideration.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that discussion on the draft resolution be deferred until the following meeting.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.