

**ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL****CONSEIL  
ECONOMIQUE  
ET SOCIAL**

RESTRICTED

E/H/AF/W.31  
10 July 1946

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

## INTERNATIONAL HEALTH CONFERENCE

## COMMITTEE II (ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE)

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING

Held at Hunter College, New York  
Friday, 5 July 1946, at 10:15 a.m.

CHAIRMAN: Dr. G. B. CHISHOLM (Canada)

1. General Discussion on Chapter VIII, Director-General and Secretariat  
(Continued).

## Paragraph 5

The CHAIRMAN announced that two amendments had been submitted to VIII, 5, one by the delegation for SOUTH AFRICA, (E/H/AF/W.21) providing for the inclusion of the words "and financial statements" after "annual budget estimates", and one by the delegation for the UNITED STATES in E/H/AF/W.1. After discussion it was agreed by the committee to adopt the amendment submitted by South Africa. The delegate for the UNITED STATES withdrew his amendment as unnecessary in view of the fact that the size of the Executive Board had been fixed at a large number and that in part the provisions of the amendment would be covered in the course of normal administrative procedure. Section VIII, Paragraph 5 was approved as amended for referral to the drafting committee.

## Paragraph 6

The CHAIRMAN announced that two amendments had been submitted to Paragraph 6, one by the delegation for CANADA in E/H/AF/W.20, and one by the delegation for SOUTH AFRICA in E/H/AF/W.21, Items 7-8. Since both amendments involved the wording and not the substance of the paragraph, it was moved by Dr. ROUTLEY (Canada) that Paragraph 6 with the proposed amendments be accepted, the final wording to be left to the drafting committee. This was approved by the committee.

Paragraph 7

The CHAIRMAN announced that an amendment had been submitted by the delegation for SOUTH AFRICA (E/H/AF/W.21) which was a rewording and did not change the meaning of the paragraph. The paragraph was adopted, and referred to the drafting committee for final wording.

Paragraph 8

The CHAIRMAN announced that three amendments had been submitted, one by the delegation for the UNITED KINGDOM (E/H/AF/W.13), one by the delegation for the UNITED STATES (E/H/AF/W.14), and one by the delegation for SOUTH AFRICA (E/H/AF/W.21). Dr. ROUILLEY (Canada) moved that the committee approve the sense of this paragraph and the amendments for referral to the drafting committee. This was approved by the committee.

Additions to Chapter VIII

The CHAIRMAN announced that two proposals for additional paragraphs had been submitted, one by the delegation for the UNITED STATES (E/H/AF/W.1) including a provision that the Director-General should prepare the agenda of meetings, and one by the delegation for SOUTH AFRICA (E/H/AF/W.21) providing that the Director-General should submit annual reports. Dr. BOUDREAU (United States) stated that these proposals had been submitted at an earlier stage of committee discussions and that he would now withdraw them. The delegate for NORWAY pointed out that the committee had already decided that the Executive Board would prepare agenda. The CHAIRMAN called attention to the fact that in normal administrative procedure the Director-General would prepare agenda for the Board, although agenda would be submitted by the Board to the Conference. Dr. GEAR (South Africa) suggested that the preparation of the report would also be a matter of administrative procedure. After further discussion, it was moved by Dr. PARISOT (France) that since the committee had already decided on the functions of the Board, a provision to be worded by the drafting committee might be added that the Director-General would assist the Board in the execution of its functions. This was accepted by the committee.

2. General Discussion of Chapter IX, Committees.

Paragraph 1

Paragraph 1 was approved by the committee without discussion or amendment.

Paragraph 2

The CHAIRMAN announced that an amendment had been submitted by the delegation for CANADA (E/H/AF/W.20) providing that the Board shall review at least annually the necessity for continuance of each committee. Dr. BOUDREAU (United States) proposed that the word "revised" should be replaced by the word "reviewed". Paragraph 2 was approved by the committee with these amendments.

Paragraph 3

Dr. BOUDREAU (United States) announced the withdrawal of the amendment proposed to Paragraph 3 in E/H/AF/W.1. Paragraph 3 was adopted without amendment by the committee.

3. General Discussion of Chapter X, Conferences.

Paragraph 1

The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegation for the UNITED KINGDOM had submitted an amendment (E/H/AF/W.13) suggesting the deletion of the word "regional" and the insertion of the word "local" before "general". Dr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) pointed out that this change would make the clause more elastic since meetings might well include more than one "region". The amendment submitted by the United Kingdom was approved by the committee. Dr. BOUDREAU (United States) called attention to the fact that the present wording of the clause restricted the freedom of the Board, and suggested the deletion of the words "in cases of emergency" so that the paragraph would read "The Conference or the Board should have . . .". This was approved by the committee. Mr. TANGE (Australia) wondered whether the interpretation of the expression "international organizations" would cover all international organizations, including regional ones. The CHAIRMAN recalled the phrase adopted by the Paris Preparatory committee to cover this point, "governmental or non-governmental, regional or international". This interpretation was

approved by the committee for the instruction of the drafting committee.

Paragraph 1 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 2

An amendment was submitted by the delegation for the UNITED KINGDOM rewording the paragraph (E/H/AF/W.13). The delegation for the UNITED STATES proposed that the Paris text be modified to read: "in conferences in which the Board considers the Organization has an interest." Mr. TANCE (Australia) approved the suggestion of the United States, but pointed out that the inclusion of the term "wide" in the United Kingdom amendment might cause difficulty of interpretation. After further discussion, Dr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) withdrew his amendment in favour of that of the UNITED STATES. The amendment of the UNITED STATES was accepted.

Paragraph 2 was thereupon adopted as amended.

4. General Discussion of Chapter XI, Headquarters.

The CHAIRMAN announced that six proposals had been submitted for the completion of Section XI: three providing that the site of the headquarters should be decided by the Assembly, by the delegation for the UNITED KINGDOM (E/H/AF/W.13) by the delegation for the UNITED STATES (E/H/AF/W.14) and by the delegation for CANADA (E/H/AF/W.20); one providing that the site of the headquarters of the World Health Organization should be at the headquarters of the United Nations, by the delegation for AUSTRALIA (E/H/AF/W.16); one providing that the headquarters should be located in Paris, by the delegations for U.S.S.R., UKRAINE, and BYELORUSSIA (E/H/AF/W.17); and one providing that the headquarters of the Interim Commission should be located at or near New York City, by the delegation for CHINA (E/H/AF/W.8).

Dr. SHEN (China) stated that his delegation also suggested the deletion of Section XI on the ground that it was not necessary that the site of the headquarters be written into the constitution. In his opinion it was necessary at this time only to decide the site of the Interim Commission.

Dr. LEON (Mexico) stated that the questions of the sites of the Interim Commission and of the permanent headquarters were two entirely different

points. The Interim Commission was a purely transitory arrangement, and there was no need for its site to be written into the constitution. He suggested that discussion be confined to the subject of the permanent headquarters.

Dr. BOUDREAU (United States), in opposing the proposal of CHINA, stated that the authority to determine the location of the headquarters should be clearly stated in the constitution.

Dr. SHEN (China) stated his willingness to withdraw his amendment in favour of those proposed by the UNITED KINGDOM, UNITED STATES and CANADA.

Dr. TANGE (Australia) presented a detailed discussion of the amendment proposed by his delegation to locate the headquarters of the World Health Organization at the headquarters of the United Nations. It was essential that all important international agencies should be centred at the headquarters of the United Nations in view of the inclusive obligations stated in the Charter of the United Nations toward health and other closely related economic and social problems. The San Francisco Conference had foreseen the great importance of the close co-ordination of all international agencies working toward human betterment. Bringing the headquarters of these various agencies together physically would be the first step in achieving co-ordination, simplifying co-operative processes, and bringing about many economies in operation. Since the World Health Organization was composed of the representatives of governments it would be impossible to dissociate it from "political influences" as expressed in the draft of the Preparatory Committee. Another point mentioned by the Preparatory Committee that the exact location of the United Nations Headquarters had not been settled, had been removed by the decision of the United Nations Assembly. He also pointed out that the establishment of regional agencies would go far in removing any misgivings which might be felt regarding too great centralization of international agencies in one location.

Dr. BUSTOS (Chile) supported the proposal of Australia. He pointed out that the location of the headquarters of the World Health Organization and the United Nations at the same site would bring about the close relationship of

the two organizations which was very desirable, and would improve co-ordination, efficiency, and economy in technical and administrative functions.

Dr. BOUTLEY (Canada) felt that it would be wise to leave the decision to the Assembly, since if the site were written into the constitution it would be very difficult to change. He therefore moved the adoption of the amendments providing that the headquarters should be located where the Assembly shall decide.

The delegate for INDIA stated that his delegation had no preference for any particular place, but he felt that contact with such specialized agencies as the Food and Agricultural Organization and the International Labour Organization was more important than that with the United Nations. He believed that the Assembly would take these circumstances into consideration, and therefore supported the amendments offered by the UNITED KINGDOM, the UNITED STATES and CANADA.

Dr. TREFI (Syria) supported the Australian amendment, and pointed out the many advantages to be gained by the close collaboration of the World Health Organization and the United Nations.

On a point of order raised by the delegate for THE NETHERLANDS regarding the motion put by the delegate for CANADA, the CHAIRMAN ruled that the committee should have full opportunity for free discussion of all motions and amendments before the committee, without being confined to the discussion of a single motion.

Dr. MEDVED (Ukraine) stated that the choice of the place where the Organization should have its seat was of great importance. He did not think it a good solution to leave it to the Assembly to decide on the location of this headquarters. On the contrary, it was desirable that the Committee should decide right away on this choice, for which two solutions had been proposed: either to have the new organization at the seat of the United Nations, or to establish it in another capital. He said the former solution appeared a priori desirable and convenient, but that it entailed serious drawbacks. The seat of

the United Nations was not yet definitely fixed, and if the principle of establishment in one and the same place were adopted, difficulties would be encountered, particularly as regards available space. He stated that the advantages of co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies were not necessarily linked to the close proximity of these different organizations. There would therefore seem to be no objection to the seat of the Organization being fixed in some other place than the seat of the United Nations. Dr. MEDVED then submitted, on behalf of the delegations for UKRAINE, U.S.S.R. and BYELORUSSIA, (document E/H/AF/W.17), the concrete proposal to fix the seat of the Organization in Paris. The attitude of the French Government was not yet definitely known. However, location in Paris would be particularly favourable for the development of the new organization. He pointed out that Paris was a most important cultural centre, in constant touch with two other intellectual centres, London and Moscow, and that it was a nucleus of rapid lines of communication with the whole world. He believed that with the support of the French Government, all the material difficulties pertaining to the installation of the organization and its numerous future activities would be easily overcome by locating in Paris.

The CHAIRMAN announced that discussion of this point would be continued at the afternoon session of the committee.

5. Congratulation to PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC, UNITED STATES and VENEZUELA

The CHAIRMAN, in the absence of a plenary meeting of the Conference, expressed congratulations, on behalf of the Conference, to the PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC on achieving its independence the previous day 4 July 1946. He also expressed congratulations to the UNITED STATES on its One-hundred Seventieth anniversary, 4 July, and to VENEZUELA on its One-hundred Thirty-sixth anniversary, 5 July, recalling the great liberator Simon Bolivar. The delegates for the PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC, UNITED STATES and VENEZUELA expressed their appreciation of the CHAIRMAN's remarks.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

-----