



**ASSOCIATION EUROPÉENNE DES MÉDECINS DES HÔPITAUX
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF SENIOR HOSPITAL PHYSICIANS
EUROPÄISCHE VEREINIGUNG DER LEITENDEN KRANKENHAUSÄRZTE
EUROPESE VERENIGING VAN STAFARTSEN
DEN EUROPÆISKE OVERLÆGEFORENING
ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟΣ ΣΥΛΛΟΓΟΣ ΝΟΣΟΚΟΜΕΙΑΚΩΝ ΙΑΤΡΩΝ ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΤΩΝ
ASSOCIAZIONE EUROPEA DEI MEDICI OSPEDALIERI
DEN EUROPEISKE OVERLEGEFORENING
ASSOCIAÇÃO EUROPEIA DOS MÉDICOS HOSPITALARES
ASOCIACIÓN EUROPEA DE MÉDICOS DE HOSPITALES
EUROPEISKA ÖVERLÄKARFÖRENINGEN
EVROPSKO ZDRŽENJE BOLNIŠNIČNIH ZDRAVINIKOV
EUROPSKA ASOCIACIA NEMOCNICNÝCH LEKAROV
EUROPSKA UDRUGA BOLNIČKIH LIJEČNIKA**

Document :	AEMH 04/030
Title:	Italian Proposal concerning the Draft AEMH Budget 2005
Author :	FNOMCEO – National Federation of the Orders of Doctors and Dentists
Purpose :	Information
Distribution :	AEMH Member delegations
Date :	15 Avril 2004

ITALIAN PROPOSAL CONCERNING THE DRAFT AEMH BUDGET 2005

The most recent Board meeting did not address the problems of using several languages, raised by the Treasurer's report during the most recent meeting in Berlin.

The solutions to a financial problem can change based on the part that is considered fixed and not reducible, and the part that is considered mobile, or variable, and that can thus be cut.

I will attempt to illustrate the reasons for which the current use of languages –two passive languages (reception) and four active languages (transmission) – cannot be reduced further.

a) From the standpoint of the history of our association, five countries have had the opportunity to work in their native tongues, i.e. French, English, German, Italian and Spanish. In face of this opportunity, France, Germany, Italy, Spain and Switzerland have always made the largest financial contribution by far.

With a good degree of approximation, if the unit quota of a national delegation (that does not generate interpreting expenses) is given the value of one, this value is doubled for Spain and Switzerland, and tripled for France, Germany and Italy.

To use an expression reflecting the Treasurer's pragmatic approach, i.e. that "those who want services must pay for them", at this stage we can comment that this has always been done, with a willingness to contribute to the common budget that far outweighs the pure accessory services (or "privileges") that have been received.

b) In all European medical associations, for years there has been an attempt to establish a quota that would respect the expectations of members countries and the planning requirement for activities and management. This quota has also been linked with the number of registered members, though this number has not always been calculated in the same way and is thus not reliable as an indicator.

c) The true value of the AEMH Statute must be interpreted in its historical development, and not merely in its most recent version, perforce adapted to the need to adhere to the laws of the country that hosts the Brussels headquarters, rather than to the spirit that has always inspired our Association.

The use of English as the sole language of reference in official documents (and in the Statute) was introduced in the Basel version, following the proposal of the Italian delegation, strictly for the purpose of overcoming potential difficulties in interpreting a set of standards by relying on the uniqueness and authenticity of a single reference text.

Instead, the other languages used to express individual ideas help enrich the dialogue and contribution of each delegate participating in joint works. The historically established richness of explanation offered in different languages has been the common heritage of our Association since its very foundation.

d) Subsequently, due to external pressures by the Treasurer pro tempore, several national delegations – such as Germany in full, and Italy and Spain in part – limited the use of their national language to help overcome the financial difficulties stemming from budgeted shared expenditures.

As noted in the introductory remarks, this shared formulation of a budget, which considers as reducible the expenses tied to the historically and justifiable consolidated active use of languages, is no longer considered feasible.

For example, we can investigate less expensive solutions, as proposed for the meeting in Madrid, using local interpreters who reside in the area.

Instead, we cannot conceive of a drastic reduction in the languages used (active and passive, in transmission and reception) and charged to three national delegations, France, Italy and Spain alone have always contributed a value equivalent to eight quotas shared three ways, thus permitting freer access to the new delegations from Eastern European countries, which share in.

In short, France, Italy and Spain contribute – and have always contributed – at least 37.4 % of the total budget. This too has its own added value, in current evaluation terms and not only in terms of past history.

Restrictive moves to their detriment or the proposal of additional fees can be viewed by these countries as an unjust limitation of their potential for expression and for making proposals with respect to other delegations for proper development of the action of AEMH;