

INTERNATIONAL HEALTH CONFERENCE

GENERAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTH MEETING

Hold at Hunter College, New York, on Monday,  
1 July 1946, at 12:30 P.M.

There were present:

Dr. Thomas Parran - in the Chair

Dr. de Paula Souza	(Brazil)
Dr. Chisholm	(Canada)
Dr. Shen	(China)
Dr. Shousha Pasha	(Egypt)
Dr. Cavaillon	(France)
Dr. Lakshmanan	(India)
Dr. Timmerman	(Netherlands)
Dr. Evang	(Norway)
Dr. Paz Soldan	(Peru)
Dr. Mackenzie	(United Kingdom)
Dr. Krotkov	(U.S.S.R.)
Dr. Gabaldon	(Venezuela)
Dr. Stampar	(Yugoslavia)

The CHAIRMAN suggested that future items for the agenda of the General Committee should be handed either to him or to his Assistant, Mr. Hyde.

Reports from the chairmen of the Working Committees on the status of their work were requested by the CHAIRMAN. Reporting for Committee 1 (Scope and Functions), Dr. SHOUSHA PASHA (Egypt), said that the Drafting Sub-committee would meet today to consider various amendments proposed by delegations.

Dr. CHISHOLM (Canada), Chairman of Committee 2 (Administration and Finance), reported that his Committee still had much work ahead. During the first few meetings the discussion had ranged widely over the whole field, but at the last meeting paragraphs (a), (b), (d), and (e) of Section VI were considered in detail. Paragraph (f) was now under discussion in a special

sub-committee. Although Dr. CHISHOLM excepted the Committee to make more rapid progress from now on, several further meetings of the full Committee would probably be necessary. In reply to a question from the CHAIRMAN, Dr. CHISHOLM gave it as his view that Committee 2 should hold a meeting each day until the general discussion was concluded.

Reporting for Committee 4 (Relations) Dr. GABALDON (Venezuela) said that there would be a meeting of the Drafting Sub-committee on 2 July for the purpose of going over the text of Section XVII of the Paris Draft. This text was discussed in a preliminary way at the first full meeting of the Committee on 26 June. One or two suggestions from observers for other international organizations had been submitted for the consideration of the Drafting Sub-committee.

At this point, the CHAIRMAN turned to Item 4 of the Agenda referring to the allocation to Committee 3 of the Paris Resolutions on the Office International d'Hygiene Publique and UNRRA. Dr. GABALDON pointed out that there had been as yet no discussion of these matters in his Committee and he asked for the views of the members of the General Committee. Chairman PARRAN suggested that since the policy relative to the Office International and UNRRA had already been decided, the legal aspects of these two matters might more appropriately be referred to Committee 4. Commenting on this suggestion Dr. EVANG (Norway) said that the proposed procedure was not quite clear to him. While he agreed with the CHAIRMAN that the policy of absorption had already been decided, at least four different methods of effecting absorption had been suggested and some decision would have to be made as to the best method to be followed. Unless the jurisdiction of the two Committees was clearly delimited there might be some confusion in dealing with the matter.

It was Dr. STAMPAR's view that the question of policy should not be raised again in committee. Both the Technical Preparatory Committee of Paris and the Economic and Social Council had gone on record in favour of the merger of all existing international organizations in the field of health with the World Health Organization. It would be for the Interim Commission

to determine the means by which such mergers should be effected.

Dr. STAMPAR proposed that Member States, when signing the Constitution, should also sign a declaration to the effect that after a certain period they would no longer maintain membership in the Office International. He further suggested that the Chairmen of the committees concerned should announce that it was the opinion of the General Committee that all questions of policy had already been determined.

It was agreed that the Paris Resolutions pertaining to the Office International and UNRR. should be referred to Committee 3.

In reporting on the status of work of Committee 5 (Regional Arrangements), Dr. TIMMERMAN (Netherlands) said that there were still three of four more speakers on his list. In accordance with the rules of procedure he, together with the VICE-CHAIRMAN and RAPPORTEUR, would nominate names for a special Sub-committee to study and report on the various proposals before the Committee.

Dr. STAMPAR expressed the opinion that the general discussion which had taken place in Committee 5 during the past three days had been very useful. It was clear from this discussion that no one wished to destroy the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau and that there was every prospect of working out a formula which would reconcile the divergent views on this problem. Dr. PAZ SOLDAN (Peru) was happy to place himself in agreement with Dr. STAMPAR's observations. The discussion thus far, it seemed to him, had indicated that in spite of differences in point of view, there was a basis for agreement by which the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau would be put at the disposition of the World Health Organization. In Dr. PAZ SOLDAN's opinion the "heroes" of the debate had been Dr SZE (China) and Dr. CAVAILLON (France), in view of their constructive proposals for a formula designed to bring together the advocates of autonomy and merger. Not only the delegates from Latin America but many others had contributed significantly to the discussion, and the great service rendered by Dr. PARRAN in presenting his statesmanlike proposal should elicit general appreciation.

Dr. STAMPAR proposed that the special Sub-committee of Committee 5 should submit first to the General Committee a draft harmonizing the the different points of view in order to avoid so far as possible extended discussion in the full committee. While Dr. TIMMERMAN was in general agreement with this suggestion, he pointed out that he could not yet determine the composition of the Sub-committee since he was required by the rules to consult with the VICE-CHAIRMAN and RAPPORTEUR. The CHAIRMAN thanked Dr. TIMMERMAN for his willingness to have the General Committee consider the report of his Sub-committee before submitting it to Committee 5.

Dr. PAZ SOLDAN feared that the proposed procedure might have the contrary effect of provoking undue discussion in Committee 5. It would be better in his view for the Sub-committee to refer its proposals directly to Committee 5 for consideration. Committee 5 would be in a better position than the General Committee to define the broad terms of agreement. Above all, nothing should be done to give the impression that the General Committee was attempting to dictate the basis of agreement.

Dr. KROTKOV (U.S.S.R.) called attention to the fact that the Paris Committee had done serious work, the results of which had been studied carefully by all the delegations participating in the Conference. He feared that there was a tendency in the discussion to forget the Paris Draft and he would, therefore, like to urge that it should always form the basis for the discussion, with the view to facilitating the technical work of the Conference and of expediting the conclusion of its labours.

Dr. SHEN (China) agreed in principle with the observations made by Dr. PAZ SOLDAN, but proposed that Committee 5 should pass a resolution providing that the report of its Sub-committee should be submitted directly to the General Committee, with the understanding that the action of the latter Committee on the report would be final.

The CHAIRMAN now pointed out that there were two distinct proposals

before the General Committee. Dr. CHISHOLM (Canada) felt that prior action by the General Committee on the report of the Sub-committee of Committee 5 might well give rise to an unfortunate impression that the General Committee was trying to "railroad" a decision. It would be preferable to follow the normal procedure. The CHAIRMAN asked Dr. TIMMERMAN if he felt free to indicate the probable size and composition of his special sub-committee. Dr. TIMMERMAN stated that in his personal opinion it would be desirable to include representation of the five Big Powers and most of the other delegates which had made specific proposals in the general debate. If this were done the sub-committee would probably have a membership of ten to twelve.

Dr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) agreed with Dr. CHISHOLM that the Sub-committee should report directly to Committee 5.

Dr. STAMPAR now explained that it is not his intention to remove consideration of the Sub-committee's report from Committee 5 but rather to provide opportunity whereby the General Committee might pass along in a preliminary way its views to Committee 5. Dr. STAMPAR opposed the inclusion of representatives of the five Big Powers in the Sub-committee and felt that its membership should be kept quite small. Dr. CAVAILLON expressed himself in agreement with Dr. STAMPAR's proposal as redefined, and Dr. TIMMERMAN concurred, pointing out, however, that better results might be obtained by making the Sub-committee a fairly representative group. Since four of the five Big Powers had made specific proposals, it seemed to him desirable to include all five of the Sub-committee.

It was not clear to Dr. CHISHOLM just how the General Committee would deal with the report of the Sub-committee. Indeed, if the General Committee were to make suggestions of its own, it might be placed in an embarrassing position.

Emphasizing the fact that the whole question respecting the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau had a psychological, emotional and even a sentimental character, it might be wise to avoid a hasty decision as to procedure.

He therefore urged that the General Committee defer action on the proposal before it until the next meeting. There would always be the possibility of intervening at a later stage.

At this point, Dr. SHOUSHA PASHA (Egypt) summarized the two proposals before the Committee and said that he disagreed with both. He would prefer to follow the normal procedure. Regarding the membership of the ad hoc Sub-committee, he felt that it would be better to provide for representation of the countries and regions most directly interested in the problem of regional arrangements. Dr. EVANG proposed that since there seemed to be disagreement in the General Committee, the normal procedure should be followed.

Dr. STAMPAR said that he was sorry for having been responsible for precipitating such a prolonged discussion. At the same time he felt that the problem of the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau was one of the most difficult and controversial questions before the Conference. It was a matter not merely of local but of world-wide interest. He further believed that it was the duty of the General Committee to assist in resolving such questions and in finding a formula which would be acceptable to all. If the General Committee could prepare an acceptable solution for Committee 5, a lot of speeches might be avoided.

Dr. de PAULA SOUZA (Brazil) considered that the best course to follow would be to allow Committee 5 to deal first with the report of the Sub-committee, and then, if no agreement is reached to refer the matter to the General Committee. Dr. PAZ SOLDAN again proposed that a decision be postponed for twenty-four hours.

In the light of the foregoing discussion, the CHAIRMAN suggested that no formal vote be taken at this time and that the normal rules of procedure be observed, without, however, closing the door to action by the General Committee at a later stage.

This was agreed to by the Committee.

It was decided that Committee 5 should meet on 2 July at 10:00 a.m.  
and Committee 2 at 2:15 p.m. by holding only two full committee meetings,  
more time will be available for the work of various sub-committees.

The CHAIRMAN stated that there were still delays in the reproduction and distribution of documents and asked that the Secretariat report on the backlog of documents at the next meeting of the Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

----