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The CHAIRMAN said that he had been astonished at previous Health Assemblies to find that in a gathering consisting mainly of medical men far more attention had been given to questions of finance and procedure than to technical questions. He hoped that in the present committee, at least, delegates would remember that they were doctors first and administrators second. At previous Health Assemblies the Report of the Director-General had often been examined in one meeting without very much interest being shown. Where the discussion had been prolonged, it had not concerned the technical aspects of the Report. If the examination of the Report of the Director-General was the only item on the agenda for the present meeting, it was in the hope that it would receive the attention that it deserved.

He suggested that the committee should begin with a general discussion and then examine the details of the Report.

Dr. GEAR (Assistant Director-General, Department of Central Technical Services), Secretary, in introducing the Report, said that he would not add to the remarks made by the Director-General in plenary session. He merely wished to say that the Director-General would welcome detailed discussion of the work of WHO in 1953 and would make available the responsible officers - regional directors and directors of technical divisions - to answer any questions.

Dr. ERICKSON (United States of America) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the Report, which showed a great deal of progress, notably in the control of malaria, tuberculosis and the treponematoses. It reflected the value of co-ordinating research
on an international level. If he might make one small criticism, the report for 1952 had been slightly better in that it had contained fuller programme descriptions and more graphs and charts. In general - and this had been recognized in the Report itself - there was a tendency, due probably to the type of request received, for services to become more specific in character. For its own part, his delegation would prefer consultation to be on a more general basis. However, as he had said, it was an excellent report and showed good progress.

Dr. STAMPAR (Yugoslavia) expressed particular interest in Chapters 1 to 10 of the Report, which contained a general review of the work of WHO in fulfilling its central responsibilities and of its administration. He agreed with the United States delegation that much progress was shown, but in the present critical financial situation a great deal of responsibility touching the future rested with the committees of the Health Assembly. The problem now facing the Organization was whether it should continue to increase its activities or decrease them.

Commenting on the activities described in the first part of the Report, he noted that the work in the control of communicable diseases was partly a continuation of the functions of the Health Organization of the League of Nations, though that organization, unlike WHO, had not been in a position to undertake field work. The Epidemiological Intelligence Service was excellent and of great service to Member States. He was particularly interested in the results of the work of the Tuberculosis Research Office in Copenhagen, and thought that a time would soon come when that work could be reviewed and achievements estimated.
The Organization's work in education and training was its most important activity, and all the resources that could be spared might well be put into it. Much had been achieved, but still more was required, as public-health services in Member countries would certainly suffer if medical and auxiliary personnel were not adequate in numbers or properly trained. Of that he would say more later.

Personally, he was most satisfied with the Organization's Publications and Reference Services. The reports and information made available to governments were one of the most positive achievements of WHO.

Public information was certainly a matter that deserved attention, but he did not always agree with the methods employed. He was not in favour of propagandist work in that field.

He now came to an important question to which he had referred earlier: could the Organization, in its present financial position, continue its activities on the same scale as in 1953? The Director-General had drawn attention to the low financial position and was asking for a larger budget. His delegation would be in favour of a larger budget, but on certain conditions. Rather than spread its activities over very wide fields, without any certainty of the value of the results, the Organization should perhaps confine itself to certain highly specific projects that could easily be financed from its own resources.

Another important question was that of the relationship between Headquarters and the regional offices. He had always been in favour of regionalization and still remained so, but he thought that the time had perhaps come for a clear
definition of responsibilities. It must be determined how far the Organization should support regional activities from its central funds and how far the regional offices should themselves provide resources for activities to promote the health interests of countries within the region. Of course, any change in present arrangements would be detrimental to world health if it were implemented too rapidly, but some plan must be worked out for gradually integrating the regional offices into the financial schemes of the Organization.

Dr. BUSTAMANTE (El Salvador) congratulated the Director-General on the Report - which his Government had happily received early enough to study it in detail - and on the way in which the material in it was presented, permitting an appraisal of the Organization's work as a whole and by parts.

He noted that the projects carried out in 1953 had been well within the broad framework of the Organization's functions. The manner in which they had been fulfilled, despite difficulties in finance and recruitment of personnel, was remarkable. In the experience of his country, WHO assistance had always acted as a catalyst, awakening public and professional interest and stimulating national activities. Indeed, if that were not the case, no budget would ever be adequate to make the Organization's activity effective.

Dr. GRASSET (Switzerland) wished to make some remarks on the work of the experts and expert committees in 1953, and to allude to the remarks made the previous day in plenary session about the usefulness of that work. As he himself in 1953 had taken part in one expert mission and one expert committee, his impressions might be of some interest.
First a distinction must be drawn between the work of expert missions and that of expert committees. Expert missions had a part to play that was of definite value. It was difficult to give effective aid to a country in the form of field projects and fellowships until it was clear how it could use that aid. In 1953 WHO had sent a team of medical specialists to Indonesia, a country of particular interest to WHO from the epidemiological point of view. He had been able personally to see the value of the co-ordination of the activities of WHO with those of UNICEF in a broad programme covering a campaign against yaws and syphilis and a campaign of BCG vaccination.

The activities of expert committees should continue at least on the same level as in recent years. The expense had been mentioned, but it would be noted that the proportion of the budget devoted to expert committees was very small indeed. It was essential that there should be an annual stocktaking of the progress made in every technical field of health. For example, the expert committee on biological standardization, in which he had himself participated, regularly took stock of progress throughout the world in the standardization of existing products, the replacement of some of them, and the development of new products.

For the next few years at least, therefore, the activities of experts both in missions and in committees should continue to be developed.

Dr. EVANG (Norway) began by retracing the stages through which the programme committee of the World Health Assembly had passed. In the earlier days it had been concerned at great length with establishing priorities for various kinds
of work to combat communicable diseases and promote health. After a time it had been realized that that was not quite the most fruitful approach, and for the last three years or so the committee had been constantly preoccupied with the importance of training personnel and developing efficient public-health administrations. One might receive the impression that those were now the most important activities of the Organization, but in fact from the Report of the Director-General one would see that WHO was still carrying on many kinds of work from the old priority list and was undertaking new activities that had not been included in that list. It was the moment to ask whether the Organization was on the right track. Personally he considered that it was. It had adopted a simple formula - the only possible formula for a world organization - to render assistance to every country according to its individual needs.

In following this path, the Organization was of course faced with certain obstacles, of which the principal was the financial situation. There must therefore be some expansion in the resources of WHO. As the Director-General had stated, more requests were already being received from governments than could be met.

As for the question of regionalization, he did not think that there was yet any serious threat of over-development of the regional organizations, but there was, on the other hand, a real danger that the staff at Headquarters might develop into what he would call "desk people", living in the beautiful city of Geneva with a standard of living far above that prevailing in most other countries needing WHO assistance, and under a constant stultifying pressure of desk work. In those circumstances it would not be surprising if headquarters staff soon ceased to be the experts that they had been and must remain if they were to do their jobs properly. He would therefore favour a great deal of travel for
headquarters staff - not merely travel in the course of their routine desk work, but travel in which they did do actual scientific work themselves. It might even be necessary to give them special leave for that purpose.

In the introduction to the Report he had noted the following words: "The problem of programme analysis and evaluation continued to occupy our attention in 1953. It is obvious that sooner or later the time will come when we must be prepared to find a more specific answer than we have at present to the question which is being more frequently raised today: To what extent are WHO programmes, now covering all the continents, contributing to the improvement of the health of the world?" On page 3 of the report itself he had noted the sentence: "Only by careful assessment of results can repetition of mistakes be avoided, methods successful in one area be adapted for use elsewhere, and technical research be initiated to improve methods and reduce costs." Now programme evaluation had often been discussed in the Health Assembly and he himself had sometimes felt obliged to sound a warning note. He distinguished two cases of evaluation, which might be called qualitative and quantitative. He was entirely in favour of qualitative evaluation, but quantitative evaluation should be undertaken with caution. It was not WHO that did health work in countries, but national administrations with help from WHO, and it was impossible to distinguish quantitatively what part of the result was due to WHO and what to the efforts of national administrations. He had therefore not quite liked the expression "to what extent" in the first passage he had quoted.

Dr. GARCIN (France) was particularly satisfied at the importance assigned in the Report to the control of communicable diseases. In the French overseas
territories in particular, the control of such diseases as malaria, the treponematoses, leprosy and bilharziasis was a major problem for health administrations, and WHO could certainly be of great assistance.

Activities in education and professional training also occupied an important place in the Report. There he was not entirely in agreement with the Director-General, who seemed to him rather to underestimate the importance of fellowships, which he personally considered one of the surest means of giving effective assistance to countries. He had himself taken part at the last nursing conference in Africa. If no strikingly new facts had emerged from the discussions, the comparison that it had been possible to draw between conditions in various countries was of the greatest usefulness. If he had any criticisms to make of such conferences, it was only that their results were not made widely enough known to national health administrations.

The exchange of scientific information was another important function of the Organization, and there too it might be well if national health administrations were more widely informed of the results achieved.

One thing that had particularly struck him in the Report was the map on page 67 illustrating the immensity of the part of Africa south of the Sahara, and he would raise that point again in the discussion on the budget to show that the funds allocated to the African Region were far from adequate. He realized that the African Regional Office had only recently been set up, and that the field activities must still be limited, but he would certainly like to see the budget for such activities considerably increased.

Professor FERREIRA (Brazil) considered that as the present committee was entitled the Committee on Programme and Budget, the remarks of delegates should cover equally both aspects of its terms of reference.
As far as the programme was concerned, delegates, as technical experts, could see that, as Dr. Evang had said, WHO was certainly on the right track. But the main difficulties facing the Organization were not technical but financial. It must be remembered - and he spoke from personal experience - that governments always sought to restrict their commitments for health work, whether national or international. Yet all the Member governments of WHO had signed a constitution laying down that health was the right of every individual and the responsibility of every State; and from that point of view the funds of WHO were not sufficient even to approach the fulfilment of its functions.

Before delegates came to Geneva they generally received an injunction not to increase their countries' contribution to the budget of WHO. His own Government's contribution to WHO was less than one half per cent. of its national expenditure on health; and probably very few governments were spending as little money as WHO had available for its purposes, even with the additional funds that it received from such sources as Technical Assistance. He felt that delegates should consider it their personal responsibility to prepare governments to contribute more and more for the expanding needs of WHO. Working with their governments, and at the same time knowing the value and significance of WHO's activities, they were in a better position than anyone else to do so.

Dr. SICAULT (Morocco - French Zone) thought that the Report of the Director-General showed no justification for the fear that WHO Headquarters might become a rather static organization. It was clear that WHO was performing its task well.
That task could be said to fall under two main headings, research and training on one side and public-health work on the other. The research and training side was represented by seminars and symposia for the exchange of ideas and information and by the fellowship programme. He was in favour of developing and increasing both these activities. Public-health work was represented in the activities of the regional offices at the national and local level. Bound up with it and consequent upon it was the work of health education, for the two activities were complementary and one was impossible without the other. For example, during the campaign against trachoma in his country the medical staff had at first applied the ointment to the patients. After some time the populace had begun to apply the ointment itself, mothers putting it on the eyes of their children and distant tribes coming to ask for the ointment that protected them against conjunctivitis.

An earlier speaker had asked whether the small resources of WHO were sufficient to allow it to undertake all those activities. The answer was certainly "Yes", for even if WHO gave only token assistance - which was far from being the case - that assistance could stimulate the most fruitful activity at the national or international level.

Mr. STEAD (United States of America) wished to discuss some of the points which stood out in the Report of the Director-General and had been mentioned by previous speakers.

The first point was the work of the Organization in education and training. He noted a tendency in the training of public-health workers to drift more and more towards specialization, producing what might be called the man of depth in a narrow field rather than the man of breadth.
Another point that had been raised was the tendency of WHO, based on its experience, to adapt the type of assistance it gave to local conditions, which might vary not merely from one region or country to another, but from one small area to another.

The third point was the budgetary position of the Organization. It was clear that all the specialized projects described in the Report were only a small fraction of what would be desirable if all needs were to be covered, and that immediately raised the problem of selection. He wished to ask one question: would it not be possible to develop a method of determining in advance what projects would be most appropriate in a given place at a given time? If no such method was yet contemplated, he wished to make the following suggestion. Instead of surveys by technical experts, which meant either a very large team or a risk of too much emphasis on the special interests of the team members, an area might be surveyed periodically by a team of one or two "men of depth", who would study the area from the point of view of man in relation to environment and environment in relation to man, and who would select a dozen or so of the most pressing health problems, estimating whether the best approach would be through preventive services directed mainly towards individuals or environmental methods directed towards the populace as a whole. From these dozen problems the experts could then select those which were most ready for immediate attack with the resources available and which would yield the most useful results for the resources expended. In proposing this method he was not underestimating the importance of evaluation after a project was over, but trying to offer the possibility of an objective approach, working from the problems to the programme rather than establishing a programme and then looking for problems to tackle.
What he had said seemed to be in contradiction with the emphasis placed by other delegates on the importance of professional training, but that was not really the case since the shortage of manpower was as important in the field of the "broad man" as in the field of the "deep" specialist.

Dr. KARABUDA (Turkey), after expressing his satisfaction with the Report, referred to the widespread anxiety about the extent to which the implementation of WHO's programme depended on the Technical Assistance funds available. He quoted the section on "Technical Assistance for Economic Development" on pages 85 and 86 of the Report. It was highly desirable that the present uncertainty should be removed, so that governments could know where they stood and set aside the funds necessary for their participation in the programmes planned.

Regarding the inter-country programmes of the European Region, he wished to express the gratitude of his Government to the Director-General for making it possible for fellows from many countries of the region to participate in the antimalaria courses organized with the sponsorship of WHO.

Dr. CASTILLO-REY (Venezuela) associated himself with other delegates who had praised the Director-General's report and the manner in which the information contained in it was presented.

He agreed with those who had stressed the importance of training of personnel, which he considered could be approached from three points of view.

In the first place, there were fellowships. There he agreed with the United States delegate that it might be well to train larger numbers of general administrators rather than specialists in narrow fields.
In the second place there were expert missions, which in his opinion should use their stay in a country to train personnel in their own particular specialities, so that the permanent results of their visit might be even greater.

Thirdly, health demonstration areas should be set up, using to the full the local resources already existing, to provide training for workers from other areas where health problems were similar. Such an activity might well have far-reaching and valuable results.

Dr. AL-WAHBI (Iraq) endorsed the views, expressed by the delegate of Brazil and other speakers, on the budgetary situation. He considered that it was high time for WHO to stand on its own feet and carry out its programmes by means of the regular budget. Additional financial help from other international sources could always be used for the further development of contemplated projects and for additional programmes.

Dr. DIBA (Iran) after expressing appreciation of the Director-General's Report, said he favoured a continuance of emphasis on teaching programmes and exchange of scientific information. He agreed with the remarks of the delegate of Iraq on the need for WHO to rely on its own budgetary resources, supplementary funds being applied towards the meeting of the constant needs in the regions. It was important that plans should be developed in such a way that programmes were not liable to be prematurely halted.

Dr. BERNARD (France) wished to make two observations of a general nature. First, in regard to the references made by several speakers to the inadequacy of the budget, he submitted that the Committee was not called upon at the present stage to deal with that matter. The point at issue was the appraisal of results achieved
in 1953 on the basis of existing financial resources. The discussion had indicated general satisfaction with the progress that had been made.

Secondly, he shared the concern expressed by the delegate of Norway lest headquarters staff - owing to the heavy burden of administrative work - become eventually too isolated from health problems and activities in the various regions. However, he wished to direct attention to the fact that the majority of headquarters officials had been selected precisely because of technical experience in their own countries. While the Norwegian proposal for increased travel to ensure greater contact with regional organizations was a valuable one, it should not be forgotten that increased travel by headquarters staff would involve further expenditure. Moreover, too frequent and systematic an interference by headquarters in regional activities might lead to duplication and overlapping.

He further drew attention to paragraph I.6 of resolution WHA6.44, recommending the interchange of staff of the Secretariat among regions and between headquarters and regions, and submitted that such a procedure would provide for the necessary contact and continuity in all the Organization's activities. He asked to what extent that recommendation had so far been applied and what methods were envisaged to ensure the most efficacious relationship between headquarters and the regional offices.

Dr. ANWAR (Indonesia), in expressing his country's appreciation of a WHO medical team sent during 1953, said that Indonesia was a young country with only the most elementary means of tackling health problems. Indonesia had also benefited from general projects for training and education, and campaigns against communicable diseases such as malaria and yaws. His Government was willing, within its limited financial means, to co-operate in the work of WHO.
Dr. DAENGSVANG (Thailand) associated himself with the tributes paid to the Director-General and to the staff both at Headquarters and in the regional offices. He mentioned that Thailand was benefiting by the work being carried out for the control of communicable diseases, particularly the treponematoses, tuberculosis and malaria. He believed that WHO was right in concentrating attention on the control of communicable diseases. However, he wished to stress the need in local health activities for properly trained workers in adequate numbers to ensure the continuation of long-term programmes, and suggested that WHO should place emphasis on the training of local workers in their own countries as well as abroad.

Dr. METCALFE (Australia) agreed with the delegate of Yugoslavia that WHO should concentrate its attention on crucial and pressing health problems such as communicable diseases and environmental sanitation. For example, in some 12 countries through which he had recently passed it was not safe to use the ordinary water supply for drinking, or eat the food, unless it were specially and carefully prepared. He noted that the project list in the report included such items as the provision of a hospital architect, rehabilitation centres, mental health seminars, medico-legal consultants and so forth, and wondered whether the Organization was not spreading its wings somewhat too widely. No doubt matters of that type were of great importance and should not be under-estimated but, in his view, they were the concern of local authorities and not the business of an international organization, whose main objective should be communicable diseases and the improvement of environmental sanitation.
Dr. LAKSHMANAN (India) endorsed the remarks of the delegates of Yugoslavia and Australia to the effect that the Organization should concentrate on a limited number of programmes rather than expand its activities in various directions. He wished to emphasize the need, in the Region for South-East Asia, of a programme of development of rural health work and, in the organization of training programmes, for the granting of fellowships for training in the particular countries of a given region rather than for study abroad.

Referring to the excellent work accomplished by two medical missions despatched to India during the past two years, he suggested that such missions should stay for at least six months for their work to be of any lasting good. In his view, a small team dealing with one particular subject and able to spend a longer period of time in a given country for the purpose of training small local groups would lead to more beneficial results.

On the question of co-ordination, he stressed the need for the fullest co-operation between all international agencies working in a particular country in order to avoid duplication and overlapping of activities. A co-ordinating committee for health activities had been set up in India, and the co-ordination of the work was now much better.

Finally he felt that little progress would be achieved in rural health work without corresponding education in health matters of the rural population - a subject on which he understood little had so far been done by WHO.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any further comments, the general discussion on the Director-General's Report for 1953 was concluded.
He would ask the Secretariat to answer certain general questions, but believed that four essential points had emerged from the discussion. First, all were agreed that the work in 1953 had been carried out satisfactorily, subject to some comments on points of detail. Secondly, certain delegates wished more emphasis to be placed on particular aspects of the programme. He suggested that those matters could be considered during discussion on the 1955 programme. Thirdly, reference had been made to the value of appraising results, as guidance for future programmes. He would not ask the representative of the Director-General to reply at once on the difficult problem mentioned by the delegate of the United States of America concerning a general appraisal before the formulation of programmes. That matter required, and would be given, careful consideration. The fourth point seemed to be general anxiety about the financial situation. The question put by the delegate of Yugoslavia about the financing of the future programme, and the question of the granting of fellowships within particular regions, would be discussed during consideration of the 1955 programme.

He proposed to ask the Director-General's representative to answer a number of general questions, but added that points with regional implications could best be answered at the afternoon meeting by the Regional Directors concerned.
Dr. GEAR (Assistant Director-General, Department of Central Technical Services), Secretary, thanked the Committee for their general comments on the Annual Report for 1953. The appraisal of the work of the Organization for the previous year was a most important matter for the Director-General. In determining the usefulness of his programmes, he was not merely guided by formal resolutions adopted by the Executive Board and the World Health Assembly on programme matters, but obtained much help and guidance from the records of discussions in the plenary meetings of the Health Assembly and in meetings of the Committee on Programme and Budget. He was convinced that the present discussion would be a most valuable guide to the Director-General, not only because of the Committee's commendation of certain methods and certain subjects, but also, and perhaps even more, because of the criticism expressed in regard to certain matters. He wished to assure the various speakers that their criticisms, proposals or suggestions would be carefully noted by the Director-General and his staff not only in considering methods for current work, but also in considering proposals for the future.

In view of the wide range of subjects covered in the Annual Report, it was impossible forthwith to give an adequate reply to many of the questions raised. He would therefore confine himself to a few general remarks, leaving it to the responsible officers to reply in more detail during examination of individual subjects and individual regions. With regard to the reference to the system of priorities originated by the First World Health Assembly and now expanded to include many other subjects, he said that the Executive Board, in preparing a general programme of work, had borne in mind earlier proposals about priorities and had also examined the results of the system of priorities. The Executive Board had also taken into account the development of the
system of regionalization as well as the system of establishing the annual programme of work through the regional committees and through the regional offices. That factor had had considerable influence in the development of priorities into the two broad groups of subjects mentioned during the discussion, namely, the strengthening of national health services and the development of programmes of medical training and education. Consequently, the remarks made by the delegates of Yugoslavia, Norway, the United States of America and Australia concerning the system of priorities and concentration of effort were of particular importance in the development of the annual programme prepared by the Director-General. However, the application of the principles enumerated by those delegations was largely determined by the regional committees and the regional offices because the individual projects originated in governmental requests.

The questions asked on the broad problem of medical education and training would be answered by the responsible Headquarters officer and the relevant regional directors during the detailed discussion of the Annual Report.

To the question raised by the delegate of France, he would reply that the Director-General was already conscious of the need for inter-regional diffusion of knowledge obtained by means of seminars, conferences and similar meetings.

On the subject of communicable diseases, the Committee would be interested to learn that the regional committees and regional offices were tackling communicable diseases as matters of major interest. That was particularly true in the Office of the Americas, the Office of South-East Asia and in the Western Pacific, such programmes being based on the degree of development in those regions and in the countries composing those regions. He assured the delegate of Yugoslavia that his comments on the
importance of publications and reference services would be borne in mind, and any further questions would be answered by the responsible officer at the following meeting.

On the subject of joint projects mentioned by the delegates of Switzerland, Brazil and French Morocco, he said that such projects were being developed, not merely as joint projects between international organizations but, wherever possible, as joint inter-regional ones.

On the remarks on the problem of evaluation and assessment, he assured the delegate of Norway that the Director-General was well aware that the responsibility for determining the assessment and the evaluation of country projects was in the hands of the governments themselves. The concern of the Director-General was to determine whether the methods used by WHO in assisting countries were being developed efficiently and usefully.

On the reference to the need for Headquarters staff to be aware of problems peculiar to the regions, he said that the Director-General was considering methods of strengthening the type of relationship suggested by the delegate of France. One method by which the Director-General was attempting to intensify contact between Headquarters and the regional offices was by assigning a senior officer, usually an Assistant Director-General, to attend the annual meeting of the regional committee, not only to explain the policies of the Health Assembly and the Director-General but, perhaps more important, to be available to regional delegations, to the regional committee and to regional offices in order to assist them and to learn of their problems and note their suggestions. In addition to that, advisers and individual technical officers to Headquarters attempted - as far as time and resources allowed -
to travel to all the regions of the world and thereby develop a useful knowledge of local conditions. Similarly, regional directors attended meetings of the Health Assembly and of the Executive Board in order to strengthen understanding and contact between Geneva and the regional offices. The Director-General was fully aware of the danger of Headquarters staff, especially senior officers, being overwhelmed by administrative work.

The remarks on planning made by the delegate of the United States of America were particularly valuable and would be taken into account as far as possible by the Director-General. The role of WHO was to provide advisers and consultants to assist in country surveys and advise countries on appropriate methods of determining the most urgent problems requiring the assistance of WHO.

He repeated that, on the many problems mentioned during the discussion, many questions would be more appropriately answered during consideration of the 1955 programme. Others might be more appropriately dealt with in the Committee on Administration, Finance and Legal Matters.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.