



TWENTY-NINTH WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE A

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHTH MEETING

Palais des Nations, Geneva
Wednesday, 12 May 1976, at 2.45 p.m.

CHAIRMAN: Professor F. RENGER (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Review of the programme budget for 1976 and 1977 (financial year 1977) (continued)	2

Note: Corrections to this provisional summary record should be submitted in writing to the Chief, Records Service, Room 4103, within 48 hours of its distribution. Alternatively, they may be handed in to the Conference Officer.

EIGHTH MEETING

Wednesday, 12 May 1976, at 2.45 p.m.

Chairman: Professor F. RENGER (German Democratic Republic)

REVIEW OF THE PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR 1976 AND 1977 (FINANCIAL YEAR 1977): Item 2.2.1 of the Agenda (Resolution WHA28.76; Official Records Nos. 220, 231 and 232) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue its discussion on the draft resolution on programme budget policy submitted at the previous meeting by a number of delegations, and to which an amendment had been proposed by the French delegation. Following such discussion, he proposed if necessary to set up a working group to consider the matter further.

Professor BEDAYA-NGARO (Central African Republic) believed that the draft resolution submitted was fully in keeping with the spirit of the action taken at the sixth special session of the United Nations General Assembly - in resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VII) - regarding the establishment of a New International Economic Order; and that it afforded an excellent opportunity for putting the principles enunciated by the United Nations into practice and for establishing what in effect could be a New International Health Order.

Emphasis had been laid on the universal and coordinating character of WHO. The present draft resolution did not at all detract from that concept but rather provided ways and means of carrying out WHO's functions in the most appropriate manner. In view of the resolution approved by Committee B, implying a certain disequilibrium in the Organization's budget between expenditure on programmes and on staff costs, it was essential that action on the point at issue should not be deferred until the following year. The developing countries were faced with immense needs, which in turn called for immense resources, and action should be immediate so that the situation could be remedied with the minimum delay.

He emphasized the fact that it was the responsibility of the Health Assembly itself to define a new philosophy and reorientation of action, the Director-General, the Executive Board and the regional offices then implementing the guidelines decided upon. The reference in subparagraph (1) to a level of at least 60% in real terms towards technical cooperation and provision of services by 1980 should be taken as reflecting a gradual process towards a goal that was imperative in view of the urgent needs of the developing countries. The allocation of funds within that general level would be the responsibility of the Director-General, advised by the Executive Board and taking into account the views expressed by the various regions.

Dr LOEMBÉ (Congo) emphasized the importance of the subject under discussion, which would lead to a decision constituting a landmark in the history of the Organization.

There was no disagreement either as regards the general appreciation of the efforts of the Director-General and his staff or the aims in view. The amendment of the delegation of France was not fundamentally opposed to the spirit of the original draft resolution. But he could not agree with the deletion of the second preambular paragraph as suggested by the delegate of Belgium, since that paragraph went beyond a merely formal statement and reflected the very real concern regarding the widening gap between the health levels of the developed and the developing countries that had been voiced by a number of speakers. He did not think it desirable to postpone adoption of the draft resolution in order to include additional indications as to the type of activity to be undertaken: that could be left to the Director-General and his staff. It should also be clearly understood that it was not the intention of the sponsors of the draft resolution to fix a rigid percentage figure which the Director-General would have to follow, but rather to provide general guidelines for gradual evolution of activities to meet the desired goal.

His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the twenty-three countries of the Group of 77, which it considered the minimum acceptable.

Dr WRIGHT (Niger) said that the importance of the present debate was apparent to all, since the subject related to the very substance of the philosophy of WHO's programme. It was essential to be clear as to the basic issues involved. Consequently, the second preambular paragraph, referring to the widening gap between the health levels of the developed and developing countries, should be retained. The draft resolution proposed the gradual achievement of a level, for technical cooperation and services, of 60% of the regular budget in real terms. The aim was twofold - both qualitative in improving technical cooperation, and quantitative in increasing the number of field projects in developing countries. When one realized that almost the entire increase of \$ 2 million for technical cooperation in 1977 would go towards increases in staff costs, the discrepancy between the funds available and the needs was all the more striking. Indeed, the biennial system of budgeting had not been entirely successful from a practical viewpoint. It was those same delegations that had advocated biennial budgeting that were now opposed to taking an immediate decision on the substance of the draft resolution. In fact, if the percentage aimed at in the draft resolution were to be reached before 1980, it might be appropriate to ask for an even higher proportion for technical cooperation, since the inflationary pressures on developing countries in connexion with WHO activities were partly due to headquarters expenditure.

His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution without amendment.

Mr UPINDI (Malawi) believed that it should be possible for the Committee to arrive at a speedy conclusion on the draft resolution, since a difference of opinion existed only with regard to the first three lines under subparagraph (1) of operative paragraph 1. Since it was evident that any savings resulting from the procedures described under (a) to (d) in subparagraph (1) would be used for technical cooperation and provision of services, the draft resolution should be adopted as it stood. The philosophy it embodied was acceptable to all.

Professor REXED (Sweden) proposed, on behalf of the delegations of Norway, Denmark and Finland as well as his own, a new second preambular paragraph, intended to strengthen the background to the draft resolution, and reading as follows:

"Aware of the necessity of continued collaboration with UNDP as well as with other sources of funds providing extrabudgetary resources for other activities;"

His delegation consistently supported all efforts on behalf of the developing countries aimed at improving health conditions, and would therefore support all proposals made within WHO which had that objective in mind. He hoped that the small working group which might be set up on the question would make it possible to reach a unanimous decision on the present draft resolution.

Mr SOOD (India), speaking as one of the delegations sponsoring the draft resolution before the Committee, said that the resolution was basically aimed at achieving a new orientation and direction for WHO's activities. Thirty years had passed since the inception of WHO, but an immense amount remained to be done. The time had therefore come to go beyond the mere initiation of further studies and to arrive at a definite plan of action for the Organization. So many diseases had still to be fought that it was a matter of urgency to agree on that new direction rather than let WHO slide into an ever-growing bureaucracy, whatever the difficulties that had to be faced.

An examination of the programme budget showed that, in addition to certain increases arising out of currency devaluation and higher postal costs, as well as an increase of only some \$ 2 million relating to technical cooperation for developing countries, the estimates for staff costs had risen by nearly \$ 10 million for 1977 as compared with 1976. He strongly urged that additional funds should go towards the betterment of living conditions of the people in Member States rather than to improving the conditions of the international civil servants themselves and maintaining a top-heavy Organization. That situation was not of course unique to WHO but prevailed among international organizations as a whole, as was shown by a recent statement by the Director-General of FAO, who had said that some 90% of the FAO regular budget went on headquarters expenditure. It was essential that that type of

administrative expenditure should be cut down, especially when one thought of the needs of the suffering masses, for instance, of the blind and the lepers in his own country. He did not understand why the Belgian delegate wished to delete the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, since it reflected the real situation in the world. WHO was a worldwide Organization and should look after the needs of the world as a whole, and not of a select few of its own officials.

He stressed that the draft resolution was, as stated in its third preambular paragraph, fully in keeping with the spirit and the letter of resolution WHA28.76, on programme budget policy with regard to technical assistance to developing countries. It should furthermore be noted that, in aiming at the achievement of a new direction for WHO action, the draft resolution did not issue any instructions to the Director-General but rather requested him to reorient the working of the Organization. Originally the Group of 77 had considered the possibility of asking the Director-General to undertake a comprehensive review but had decided upon the use of the word "reorient", so that it was clear that action rather than further study was called for. The proportion of 60% had been arrived at as a compromise of the various figures discussed when drafting the proposal. It was essential to realize what could be done by individual countries with their share of any such increase: in his own country, for example, a sum of, say, \$ 500 000 could provide an appreciable amount of vitamin enrichment to prevent blindness.

It seemed to him that there could not be any misunderstanding as to what was intended by the term "technical cooperation". It covered what used to be meant by "technical assistance", i.e. the provision of funds, equipment and services to the developing countries. That in his view, was the basic call on any additional funds - not an increase in the living standards of staff at headquarters and the regional offices. It was impossible to compromise on that general point any longer. However, it was clear from the draft resolution that the Director-General was free to utilize the remaining proportion of 40% as he saw fit.

There could be no objection to the reference, under subparagraph (1)(d) of operative paragraph 1, to "making optimum use of the technical and administrative resources available in the individual developing countries". He had himself noted a tendency, where projects in his own country had been concerned, for staff and equipment to be brought in from abroad when adequate equipment and qualified personnel, costing less, were available on the spot.

He stressed the full confidence the Group of 77 placed in the Director-General who would, under the terms of the draft resolution, report on the situation to the Thirtieth World Health Assembly. The draft resolution left it to the Director-General to do what he could on the basis of the guidelines it provided; but it was important not to defer action. In any case the Health Assembly would have the opportunity the following year of studying a report by the Director-General on the developments in the situation.

He was unable to agree with the amendment proposed by the French delegation, which seemed to him largely a question of semantics. The time had come to implement objectives rather than engage in yet more studies. The Group of 77 had approved a carefully considered draft and would wish it to be accepted as it stood, without amendment and without the setting up of a working group.

Dr CORNEJO-UBILLÚS (Peru) supported the draft resolution because it expressed to a great extent the doctrine and philosophy of the institutions concerned with social and economic development. There was general agreement on the urgent need for an immediate improvement in the condition of developing countries, which could not be attained by words alone. Immediate action was necessary, and methods of satisfying world concern about the development process already existed. The content of the draft resolution was in accordance with the policy of the United Nations for solving the economic and social problems of the developing world and with that of WHO for promoting the health programmes of the developing countries. The purpose of the draft resolution was to set forth a policy for the financing of technical cooperation programmes; it was based on principles and facts recognized by the Organization and by other international or regional institutions. It tried to simplify procedure at the different levels of technical and administrative work and to set priorities - in the world, in the poorest countries, in specific programmes, and at all levels - in order to achieve a better distribution of technical and administrative resources. Apart from certain semantic details, everyone appeared to agree with that policy of developing programmes and suitably distributing resources. The 60% target set in the draft resolution as a minimum was to be reached over a certain number of years; and the Director-General and the evaluation services should

constantly analyse its progress to see that the policy was being rationally, justly and humanely applied.

Dr SAIED (Panama) saw no dichotomy between the Organization's functions and its administration, which formed a single whole. What was needed was a machinery that would use the Organization's resources to further its objectives, namely the health of all peoples of the world. The draft resolution was not intended to direct the work of the Director-General, because there was no discrepancy between his policies and the objectives of the Organization. On the contrary, he was making every effort to ensure that the programmes reached not only the countries concerned but everyone within those countries. The purpose of the draft resolution was to provide the Director-General with a weapon to enable him to institute reforms and reorganizations in order to attain these objectives. The Director-General's recognition of world problems and his desire to improve the distribution of budgetary resources were shown not only in his opening statement to the current session, but also in the Board's report on the proposed programme budget for 1976-1977 (Official Records No. 231, Part I, Chapter I, paragraphs 7-11), which showed his concern for the implementation of resolution WHA28.76, and above all for an improved distribution of resources in favour of country programmes. He had stressed that all such activities were the fruit of cooperation and solidarity among countries and not assistance or charity, because all countries had equal right to benefit from the Organization's resources.

The problem now was that, instead of the Organization supporting the health development of countries, there were a large number of poor countries that could no longer support the cost of the Organization. The only way to change that situation was to redirect budgetary expenditure. The figure of 60% mentioned in the draft resolution might have to be changed in the course of the years. However it was essential to set a definite target and not, as the French amendment did, make vague statements about the ratio of establishment costs to programme expenditure. Nor was it possible for WHO, as suggested in that amendment, to wait until 1980 before changing its policies. His delegation therefore opposed the amendment, proposed by the French delegation. With regard to the Belgian amendment, he wondered if that delegation would agree to the deletion of the word "widening" instead of the whole of the second preambular paragraph.

There were many ways of improving the budgetary situation. For example, one of the main points of discussions throughout the world, including the Technical Discussions at the current session, was the matter of the environment. Yet the budget for 1976 allocated 9.06% to promotion of environmental health and that for 1977 only 6.80%. The allocation for strengthening of health services decreased in those same years from 26.14% to 25.84%. Many delegates who were opposing the draft resolution had referred on several occasions to the need to improve the distribution of resources and to make savings. Nevertheless, despite all their efforts, the only savings the Administration had been able to make was \$ 22 550 for printing costs. Most of the increases in the budget related to salaries, which showed the need to revise the personnel and administrative policies. That did not mean that his country was against the whole of the Administration or the Secretariat, many of whom did important and constructive work. But the staff who were neither productive nor hard-working could be dispensed with. There was general concern that the budget was increasing to such an extent that the contributions of Member States would inevitably be increased, and this would present great difficulties for many countries, in the present inflationary period.

The CHAIRMAN asked the delegate of Panama if he formally proposed the deletion of the word "widening" in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

Dr SAIED (Panama) said that if the Belgian delegate did not insist on the deletion of the paragraph, there would be no need for his own amendment.

Mr CAMARA (Guinea) said that, during the past few years, there had been discussions in all international organizations with a view to making substantial, if not radical, changes in their philosophy and structure. Guinea had always been in favour of gradual changes in the policy of international organizations because it realized that their original constitutions were not applicable in modern times. He thought that it was generally agreed that changes must be made in the light of the contribution made by new nations and new attitudes. That was the reason for the search for a new and more balanced order at all economic and social levels.

But it must be done in a spirit of cooperation, and it was in that spirit that the Group of 77 had submitted its draft resolution, which would give new working directives to the Organization, with a view to obtaining maximum efficacy and profitability. In suggesting a percentage, the sponsors had wished to give a basis for future activities and the preparation of future budgets. They could not agree to the French delegation's amendment, which was not precise enough and would make the draft resolution almost meaningless.

Member States were suggesting a new policy for WHO that would enable it to tackle the serious problems of the modern world. The Group of 77 did not wish to question the part played by the Director-General, whose recent introduction statement had shown his wish to see the Organization helping Member States, especially the developing countries, to strengthen their health services and improve the health of their population. Member States should help him to carry out that policy and not prevent him from doing so. The developing countries made proposals such as the draft resolution in order that WHO should remain faithful to its Constitution, especially the preambular paragraph stating that the health of all peoples was fundamental to the attainment of peace and security and dependent upon the fullest cooperation of individuals and States.

He therefore hoped that the delegations which were not yet ready to accept the draft resolution would withdraw their amendments. The Belgian delegation's amendment was not in line with present practice, since many resolutions adopted by organizations within and outside the United Nations system spoke of the widening gap between the developed and the developing countries. Most of them referred, of course, to levels of development - but the same was true of health. As regards the amendment of the French delegation, he thought it preferable to give a precise figure and timetable rather than a vague indication, since the former would give a basis upon which the Director-General, the Executive Board and the Health Assembly could work.

Mr JOSHI (Nepal), as a sponsor of the draft resolution, believed that 60% was not too high a percentage. However, as some delegations did not agree, a working group could perhaps reach a suitable compromise.

Mr BRECKENRIDGE (Sri Lanka) said that the question of the allocation of funds from the regular budget for technical assistance was certainly not new in WHO. Some speakers had argued that resolution WHA28.76 was adequate, and that all that was now needed were studies on the matter. That was a misunderstanding of the implications of resolution WHA28.76. The purpose of the draft resolution now before the Committee was to give the Director-General supplementary guidelines as to how to pursue his action. It was surprising that delegations which had adopted resolution WHA28.76 could not agree to such an extension.

The question of providing funds for technical cooperation from regular budgets had been a problem for over 10 years throughout the United Nations system. The draft resolution was not intended to abolish UNDP or belittle its work. His delegation therefore hoped that the sponsors would give further consideration to the amendment of the Scandinavian delegations, which would dispel any fears that the draft resolution was attacking UNDP.

All had been in agreement with the setting up of voluntary funds for operational activities; many documents were available on the subject, and there was no need for the Executive Board to make further studies. Resources were in fact being wasted in attempts to use voluntary funds for technical cooperation programmes. Overdependence on voluntary funds for operational activities merely led to enormous secretariats. The purpose of the draft resolution was to see how far the regular budget could be used for technical cooperation along with extrabudgetary resources. Proposals for further studies at the present stage seemed suspect because the facts were available to all - and if the programme could not be handled, Member States should be informed. The fact that a large proportion of extrabudgetary programme support costs were being borne by the regular budget was evident from the organizational study made by the Executive Board (Official Records No. 231, Part I, Annex 8), which stated that the average cost of technical support by WHO to UNDP-financed projects in 1975 had totalled approximately 23% of project delivery costs. The Group of 77 wished to stop the drain on the regular budget that this constituted.

Doubts had been expressed as to whether operational activities were in accordance with the constitutional functions of the World Health Organization. In that case it could be argued that all operational activities were out of order. That was no longer true in the light of the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted at the seventh special session of the General Assembly.

The sponsors of the draft resolution found the amendment proposed by the French delegation totally unacceptable, because it would remove all substance from the original draft resolution. Moreover, the amendment did not propose that anything should be done (except for studies) until 1980, which was the end of the Second Development Decade. The draft resolution did not refer to "establishment costs" but to the regular budget: to confuse the issue was to give the Director-General no directives at all. The phrase "to ensure optimum achievement of the Organization's objectives" was too vague. He could therefore see no way in which the sponsors of the draft resolution could find a compromise between their text and the amendment of the French delegation. He had a similar reaction to the Belgian proposal. Nevertheless both delegations said that they were not opposed to the substance of the draft resolution. That being so, he could see no reason for the lengthy discussion or for the proposal that a working group should be appointed to find a compromise solution.

Professor HALTER (Belgium) said that all those with whom he had discussed the draft resolution had had no problem with it, in the sense that they had all voted for resolution WHA28.76. However, it was now proposed to introduce into the policy accepted the previous year a new element that appeared to be dangerous, especially for the members of the Group of 77.

He regretted the comments made by the delegate of India with regard to the amendment of the Belgian delegation. It had long been the custom for the Assembly to make sure that the resolutions it adopted did not contain any inaccurate statements that might arouse doubts in the public mind and also that they did not contain anything that could render difficult the functioning of the Organization. Emphasis had always been placed on the need for increased solidarity, but the discussion seemed to show divisions appearing in the Assembly. The energy that had been expended on arguing about the draft resolution might better have been devoted to trying to mobilize new resources to bring the budget of WHO to a level commensurate with the enormous needs of the populations of the world.

He had suggested deleting the second paragraph of the preamble because he was convinced that it was not accurate: resolution WHA28.76 had spoken of a difference in the health standards between developed and developing countries but not of a widening gap. If the Assembly supported the proposal of the delegate of Panama, he would willingly withdraw his amendment leaving only the phrase that had already been accepted by the Twenty-eighth World Health Assembly.

He could not imagine that the situation of one country or group of countries in relation to another group could be used as a valid argument for placing a precise figure on the amount of the regular budget to be allocated to a particular area at the expense of headquarters. Nor had he expected to hear so many delegates for whom he had a high regard reading into his proposals intentions that were not there. He still believed that if the figure of 60% were maintained in the resolution, this would not be to the advantage of the countries requesting it. An increase or decrease of 1% or 2% would not represent more than a million or two dollars; yet a whole day had been devoted to a discussion of this question, when the needs ran into hundreds of millions of dollars.

Some delegates doubted the value of a study by the Director-General - but it was precisely by carrying out a careful study that it would be possible to determine the ways in which savings could be effected. One delegate had implied that it was useless to discuss the draft resolution, since it had been agreed upon by the Group of 77 and could be immediately voted on in plenary. He hoped the Assembly had not yet reached that point, which would signify for him, the end of the Organization. Delegates came to the Assembly to put their points of view and to hear the views of others. At the present time, his own country contributed 1.02% of the budget - and added 40% in voluntary contributions; it did not ask for anything more from the Health Assembly than the satisfaction derived from scientific meetings, discussions with colleagues, and studies for the benefit of the world as a whole.

He shared the opinion of those delegates who said that the resolution WHA28.76 was sufficient; but he was ready to go part of the way with those who wished for something different. It should not be forgotten, however, that the Committee was called upon to adopt a resolution approving the proposals of the Director-General and the Executive Board on the modifications to the 1977 budget. Had the delegates been members of a working group, they would probably have been able to formulate a single resolution approving the modifications, approving the report of the Executive Board, giving a new orientation to the programme, and requesting the Director-General, as far as possible, to accelerate the process already set out in resolution WHA28.76.

Dr M'BAKOB (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the resolution before the Committee seemed to be moving in the direction of a new health order, which could be the starting point for a true health revolution. But like all revolutions it would not win the support of everyone immediately. There seemed to be general agreement on the basic philosophy underlying the resolution; if there was any controversy, it centred on the figure of 60%. It had been suggested that the Director-General should make a study of the question, but any study could only lead to a figure similar to that proposed.

His delegation therefore fully supported the resolution. The proportion of approximately 60% - instead of the present 27% - seemed to him reasonable, since the main aim of the Organization was to devote the greater part of its resources to the provision of services and to technical cooperation for health promotion. The resolution would give the Director-General the means of taking action for the establishment of a new world health order at a time when there was talk everywhere of a new international economic order. This was all the more essential, since it was not possible to bring about economic change without changing those parameters, such as health, that contributed to socioeconomic development.

Professor ONGOM (Uganda) supported the draft resolution; he thought there seemed to be a consensus in favour of it. He moved the formal closure of the debate, possibly after giving an opportunity for one or two more delegates to speak against the resolution.

Sir John BROTHERSTON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking on a point of order, asked whether the amendment he had submitted earlier, but which had not yet been circulated, could be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN replied that as the formal closure of the debate had been moved, it would not be possible to consider the amendment immediately.

The SECRETARY, at the request of the CHAIRMAN, read out Rule 61 of the Rules of Procedure of the Health Assembly.

Professor AUJALEU (France) spoke against the closure of the debate. He had already asked for the floor earlier and what he had to say would, he believed, simplify the discussion.

Dr SAIED (Panama) regretted that the delegate of Uganda had requested closure of the debate on such an important matter as the utilization of the funds of the Organization. The resolution was not one simply to be approved but should be discussed, and he would like to have the opportunity to hear all opinions. He was therefore against the closure of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the motion by show of hands.

Decision: The motion was rejected by 73 votes to 7, with 24 abstentions.

Dr STEENFELDT-FOSS (Norway) said that so far the debate had indicated full agreement on principle. There was some dissent, however, on the possible consequences of binding the hands of the Director-General by fixing a level of at least 60% for the allocations of the regular budget towards technical cooperation and provision of services. He had studied the phrasing of operative paragraph 1(1) and had found that it was very carefully formulated. The resolution stressed the responsibility of the Executive Board in ensuring the implementation of resolution WHA28.76. Provided that the Executive Board, in close cooperation with the Director-General, would take full constitutional and professional responsibility for the reorientation, he would support the draft resolution, with the amendment proposed by the Swedish delegation on behalf of the Scandinavian countries. He was anxious that the concern regarding the widening gap between the health levels of the developed and developing countries should find concrete expression, as it did in the draft resolution; that resolution could serve as an example to other international organizations whose operation was being strangled by administrative costs. The delegation of Norway had full confidence in the ability of the Director-General and Executive Board to implement the proposed reorientation of the programme budget policy in such a way that would ensure the solid professional and constitutional basis of WHO.

Professor AUJALEU (France) said he had three observations: First, as one of the oldest and most assiduous delegates to the Assembly, he must state that it was not true to say that WHO officials were living in the lap of luxury or were not earning their money. It was not only not true, it was also inconsistent with the action of the Assembly in voting increases in staff salaries and in repeatedly congratulating the Director-General and his staff on the excellent work they had done. Secondly, it would be dangerous to make WHO into a supply organization, providing products instead of knowledge and advice. Thirdly, several delegates seemed to think that the intention of the amendment proposed by the French delegation was to suppress subparagraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) in operative paragraph 1(1) of the draft resolution. That was not the case. Furthermore, the amendment had not been proposed because the figure of 60% was, in itself, undesirable, but because it appeared to be premature to take a decision on this subject. His delegation would have preferred a rapid study to determine whether this was a suitable percentage, since the factors on which it was based did not seem to be absolutely determinant, and there were many things that remained undecided. He did not know, for example, whether someone who administered vaccine in the field should be considered a staff member or part of the programme services. Similar considerations applied to a nurse who gave a course at WHO's expense in a school for nurses, or to a consultant who was sent to a country to help implement a programme. Precise definitions were required.

The amendment of his delegation would cause no delay because it requested that the study be carried out by the Executive Board in time to be presented and utilized by 1980. He had not expected the amendment to have an enthusiastic reception, but neither had he expected it to arouse such passionate opposition. If the draft resolution were adopted as it stood, the Director-General on receiving the instructions it contained would inevitably have to make a study in association with the Executive Board, as a result of which he would perhaps come back to the Assembly and say that the figure of 60% was not feasible, and that perhaps it should be 58% or 63%. Since the study would have to be made in any case, he would withdraw the amendment.

Dr VILCHIS (Mexico) said that, although the debate had been a passionate one, everyone supported the doctrine behind the draft resolution. The important thing was that the resolution offered a new orientation in budgeting and recognized the advisability of increasing assistance to programme activities. He wondered however why it spoke of "phasing out projects which have outlived their utility": if they were no longer useful, they should be abandoned immediately.

The Mexican delegation supported the resolution. He agreed however with the delegate of Belgium that the Assembly was important as a place for an exchange of views and for finding ways of helping other people. At the present time, the principle of human solidarity seemed to be disappearing. He thought the Organization was passing through a dangerous period.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.