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1. PROGRAMME AND BUDGET FOR 1952 (continuation); Item 6.5.4 (Official Records No. 31: Documents A4/31 and A4/39)

Dr. SHAH (Pakistan) remarked that the proposed programme and budget for the financial year 1952 differed from those of previous years in that it was an integrated international health programme including the regular budget and the estimated technical assistance and UNICEF funds. The proposed regular budget amounted to $8,293,905 as opposed to $7,000,000 for 1951. That increase would necessarily entail additional contributions from Member States. Pakistan would oppose the proposal if WHO maintained its present policy. He felt that the programme should be adjusted to the available financial resources.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the fact that several proposals had been submitted to the committee in earlier meetings and referred specifically to the proposal by the Canadian delegation to the effect that no resolution should be adopted but that a report should be presented to the joint meeting of the Committee on Programme and the Committee on Administration, Finance and Legal Matters. He asked for a vote by show of hands on that proposal since the others depended on its rejection or adoption.

Decision: The proposal of the delegate of Canada was rejected by 19 votes to 19, with 4 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN then pointed out that proposals had been submitted by the delegations of Australia, Ireland, Norway and the United Kingdom. Considering the proposal by the delegation of Norway to be the furthest removed in substance from the original proposal, he asked the committee, in accordance with Rule 51 of the Rules of Procedure, to vote on that proposal first.
Decision: The draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Norway, in document A4/AFL/7 was adopted by 36 votes to 14, with one abstention.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Rapporteur to prepare a summary of the committee's discussions to be presented to the joint meeting of the Committee on Programme and the Committee on Administration, Finance and Legal Matters at the same time as the adopted resolution.

2. SCALE OF ASSESSMENT FOR 1952 - JAPAN; Item 6.5.3.2 of the Agenda (Document A4/24)

The CHAIRMAN read a letter received by the Director-General from the Chief of the Japanese delegation which stated that the Japanese Government had taken the necessary steps to ensure that, should the Fourth World Health Assembly vote in favour of admitting Japan to membership, the required instrument of acceptance would be deposited immediately with the Secretariat of the United Nations. Further, in view of the financial difficulties in Japan and the low standard of living, the Japanese Government would wish the assessment for Japan to be as low as possible.

Mr. HAGIWARA (Observer, Japan) assured the committee that should Japan be admitted to membership it was ready to co-operate fully and to assume all its obligations and duties under the WHO Constitution. He stressed that, while his country was ready to pay its contributions as from the financial year 1951, the Japanese Government would appreciate as low an assessment as possible in order to avoid too heavy a burden on its foreign currency payments. The Japanese budget for 1951 had already been voted by parliament and included approximately $100,000 for the contribution to WHO. However, an assessment of 214 units was approximately double the sum provided for.
The CHAIRMAN asked whether the committee wished to maintain the assessment for Japan at 214 units or propose a reduction, subject to confirmation by the Health Assembly.

Mr. RUEDE (Switzerland) asked whether, when the scale of assessments had been drawn up, the current difficulties of Japan had been taken into consideration.

Mr. SIEGEL, Secretary, answered that the scale of assessments had been drawn up according to the criteria used in the case of all Member States and that no additional considerations had been taken into account.

Mr. CALDERON PUIG (Mexico), Dr. HASHEM (Egypt) and Dr. FABINI (Uruguay) were in favour of reducing the assessment of Japan.

The CHAIRMAN then asked whether the committee would be prepared to accept a recommendation that the assessment be reduced.

It was so agreed.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that a working party be set up to consider by how much the assessment might be reduced, and that the working party be composed of delegates of Ceylon, Egypt, New Zealand, Switzerland and Uruguay.

It was so agreed.

3. BUDGET - FORM OF PRESENTATION OF PROGRAMME AND BUDGET: Item 6.5 of the Agenda (Official Records No. 28, page 63; Official Records No. 29, page 10, Annex 6; Official Records No. 31)

The CHAIRMAN referred to resolution WHA3.107 of the Third World Health Assembly and resolution EB6.820 of the Executive Board.
Dr. GEAR, Chairman of the Executive Board, read resolution EB6.R20, "Form and Presentation of the Programme and Budget for 1952". The United Nations General Assembly had asked specialized agencies to consider, in preparing the budget, estimates of expenditure from technical assistance and other extra-budgetary funds and the uses to which such funds would be put, indicating their source. This was done also in the case of the joint WHO-UNICEF programme.

The proposals adopted by the Executive Board embodied the decisions taken at the General Assembly in 1950 and included headquarters proposals, regional proposals (subdivided by a regional budget), projects financed from the UN special account for technical assistance, and the projects financed in part by UNICEF.

Dr. HOJER (Sweden) said that some delegates felt that the committee should give advice for the future. The question should be examined on a basis of knowledge of prevailing conditions, the extent of activities involved and the assurance that planning in co-operation with governments would be effective. It was doubtless those necessities which the General Assembly had had in mind in asking specialized agencies to specify what part the programmes derived from technical assistance and other extra-budgetary funds. He would propose a draft resolution.

The Committee on Administration, Finance and Legal Matters recommends to the Fourth World Health Assembly the adoption of the following resolution:
Recalling the instructions to the Executive Board and the Director-General by the Third World Health Assembly concerning the form and presentation of the Director-General's programme and budget estimates, and

Having noted the action taken by the Executive Board in this matter, and

Having noted a resolution by the General Assembly of the United Nations requesting specialized agencies, inter alia, to provide in their regular budget documents information concerning the estimates for expenditure of technical assistance funds, as well as other extra-budgetary funds;

The Fourth World Health Assembly

COMMENDS the Director-General for having carried out the instructions of the Third World Health Assembly so effectively;

CONSIDERS the form and presentation of the programme and budget estimates as contained in Official Records No. 37 as an adequate basis for discussion by the Health Assembly of the Director-General's annual programme and budget estimates;

REQUESTS the Director-General to continue this form and presentation of his annual programme and budget estimates;

REQUESTS the Executive Board and the Director-General to study ways and means of providing the Health Assembly with additional information, which should enable it to exercise to the fullest extent possible its function under the Constitution to act as the directing and co-ordinating authority on international health work.
Dr. PADUA (Philippines) warmly approved the implementation of a policy of decentralization. The United Nations resolution calling on specialized agencies to justify their programmes had been implemented; there remained to discuss the financial aspect of the integrated programme. In studying and taking decisions on the WHO and UNICEF programmes the Organization would be fulfilling its co-ordinating function. The Philippine delegation wished the form of presentation of the programme and budget to remain as hitherto adopted.

Dr. TABA (Iran) formally proposed that the existing form of presentation should be continued, since it was clear and straightforward.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the draft resolution presented by the delegation of Sweden should be reproduced for distribution to members and discussed at the following morning's meeting.

*It was so agreed.*


Rajkumari AMRIT KAUR (India) pointed out that the resolution in document A4/AFL/4 put forward by the Indian delegation had been suggested as a means of raising money until the proposal for WHO stamps had made more progress. Though not all countries were anxious for another campaign, some would agree to the sale of seals. In the previous year, as a result of a three-month campaign, India had collected a million rupees from the sale of "TB stamps". Such a campaign could popularize the work of WHO and show the man in the street what the Organization was doing. Since it would be purely voluntary, it was difficult to see any objection.
The CHAIRMAN explained the implication of clauses (4), (5) and (6) of the proposed resolution.

Dr. GEAR said that in putting forward the proposals in EB6/R32 the Executive Board had gone some way towards meeting the wishes of the Health Assembly.

Dr. BRISKAS (Greece) supported the proposal of the Indian delegation, which was on the lines of his own suggestion to the Committee on Programme in 1948. Both the financial and psychological effects were important and an issue of stamps would be good propaganda. The money raised could greatly help scientific research.

M. GEERAERTS (Belgium) regretted that, though appreciating the motives inspiring the resolution, and though the head of the Belgian delegation had proposed a WHO stamp at the Second World Health Assembly, he must point out the complications involved where the Universal Postal Union and the postal administrations of various countries were concerned. Any money so raised should be at the disposal of the issuing country.

Rajkumari AMRIT KAUR (India) felt that the representative of Belgium had misunderstood her resolution. She had not spoken of stamps, but of seals, which could in no way affect postal agreements.

The CHAIRMAN apologized for the misunderstanding, explaining that there had been an error in the French translation, which should read "vignette" not "timbre".
Dr. van den BERG (Netherlands) stated that the Netherlands had always advocated the issue of government stamps in support of the World Health Organization and national health services. He fully supported the Indian delegation's resolution, which he would like amended to include the provisions of resolution EB7.R33 of the Executive Board (Official Records No. 32, page 12).

Rajkumari AMRIT KAUR (India) accepted the addition to the Indian delegation's resolution proposed by the representative of the Netherlands.

M. GEERERTS (Belgium), while accepting the suggestion in regard to seals, thought that a bigger proportion of the resulting money should be given to the World Health Organization.

Dr. BRISKIS (Greece) said a stamp would be more useful than a seal since it would serve to raise more money and would be a better instrument of propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Executive Board had already settled the question at the seventh session in a resolution leaving the decision to individual governments. All that was now in question was the allocation of the resulting funds between WHO and national governments.

Dr. van den BERG (Netherlands) said that, in the light of the Chairman's remarks, he had no further comment to make.

Dr. TABA (Iran) opposed any change in financial allocation. An increased proportion given to WHO would involve a decrease in national revenues from the sale of stamps and seals for charitable purposes. He would, however, propose a definite time of year for their sale and the institution of an official WHO Day on the first day of the week.
Mr. SIEGEL, Secretary, pointed out that proceeds from such sales would be in national currencies and could best be used for work within the countries concerned. There were limitations on the use of those currencies.

Dr. van den BERG (Netherlands) considered it essential to the success of any such scheme that countries should be completely free to choose the date of issue.

Dr. ROMERO Y ORTEGA (Chile), while supporting the Indian proposal (document A4/AFL/4) suggested that paragraph 3(4), though useful in itself, was incompatible with paragraph 3(7). The latter paragraph should be amended to state that such funds should be used only for technical assistance programmes, public health programmes, or fellowships — not for the budget of the Organization.

Dr. BRISKAS (Greece) proposed a campaign of two or three months and one and the same day of issue in all countries for a WHO stamp. The essential was that the whole world should be brought to realize the work of the Organization.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in addition to the Netherlands amendment to the Indian resolution, there was an Iranian proposal to limit the sale of seals to a specific period. He welcomed the views of the meeting.

On a vote, the Iranian proposal was rejected.

The representative of Chile proposed amending clause 3(7) as follows: "The Fund shall be used solely for the purpose of technical assistance programmes, public-health programmes, or fellowships in public health".
Mr. INGRAM (United States of America) expressed the view that any delimitation of the uses to which money from the sale of seals might be used would harass not help the Organization. Paragraph 3(7) was superfluous and should be deleted, whereas the provision for an annual review of the suspense account by the Assembly should remain.

The SECRETARY thought there might be confusion on the fund mentioned in paragraph 3(7). "Fund" there referred to the fund authorized in paragraph 3(7) which derived its revenue from the initial transfer of $5,000 from the suspense account mentioned in paragraph 3(6) and the 25 per cent of the proceeds accruing to the Organization. On his interpretation, paragraph 3(7) provided for an annual review of the operation of the fund - it in no way dealt with the 75 per cent retained by each country. If the representative of Chile thought that specific amounts and their use should be decided by the Assembly, it was for him to move a resolution.

Dr. ROMERO Y ORTEGA (Chile) said that his proposal had been misunderstood. His suggestion should not be interpreted as a limitation on the activities authorized on the basis of such a fund, though the ordinary WHO budget should make provision for such activities. He referred only to the 25 per cent allocated to WHO - a special fund. He was not prepared to withdraw his proposal unless that of the United States delegation for the deletion of paragraph 3(7) were accepted, since the question was one of the normal allocation of WHO funds.
Mr. INGRAM (United States of America) withdrew his motion for the deletion of paragraph 3(7) in view of the Secretary's observations.

Decision: The CHAIRMAN declared that, as there were no objections, resolution Ad/LFXJ4, as proposed by the Indian delegation and amended by the representative of the Netherlands, was approved.


The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the committee to resolution EB7.R38 and EB7.R36 and Annex 17, Official Records No. 32. Since there were no comments he proposed that the committee should pass a resolution taking cognizance of the document.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 5.0 p.m.