MINUTES
OF THE
94TH SESSION
OF
THE GOVERNING BODY

LONDON—25-31 JANUARY 1945

Extract: pp. 59-90, 124-129
MINUTES OF THE SEVENTH SITTING
(Monday, 29 January 1945 — 2.40 p.m.)

The Governing Body was composed as follows: Mr. Goodrich (Chairman), Mr. Agnides, Mr. Antoine, Mr. Bengough, Mr. Bianchi, Mr. Chu Hsueh-Fan, Mrs. Clegg Riedel, Mr. Dahl, Mr. Erulkar, Sir John Forbes Watson, Mr. Fuss, Mr. Gemmill, Mr. Gouthier, Mr. Hallsworth, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Hjelmtveit, Mr. Kosina, Mr. Kovacevich, Mr. Laurent, Mr. Lecocq, Sir Frederick Leggett, Mr. Li Ping-heng, Mr. Lombardo Toledano, Mr. Martin, Mr. McDavitt, Sir David Meek, Mr. Oldenbroek, Mr. del Río y Cañedo, Mr. Stanczyk, Mr. Warning, Mr. Watt.

Absent: Mr. Alvarado.

THIRD ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Proposals concerning Industrial Committees

General Discussion.

The Acting Director said that the Governing Body had had this question before it for well over a year. It had been brought forward at the 91st Session by Sir Frederick Leggett on behalf of the United Kingdom Government, and had been discussed at Philadelphia. The Governing Body was now called upon to take decisions concerning, first, the selection of the industries for which committees should be set up; secondly, the determination of the composition of each industrial committee and the method to be followed in choosing its members; and thirdly, the time, place and agenda of the meetings of the industrial committees which it was decided to set up.

With regard to the selection of industries, the Office had submitted a preliminary list to the Governing Body. With regard to the composition of the committees, the Office had suggested that when it had been decided to set up a committee for any particular industry, the Governments of the countries in which that industry was considered to be of sufficient importance to justify representation on the committee should be the instruments through which the choice of the Employers' delegates and Workers' delegates was made, under a form of procedure similar to that through which the Employers' and Workers' delegates to the sessions of the International Labour Conference were chosen. In the case of each committee the Government would have to determine which were the most representative organisations in the particular field concerned.

There was an alternative procedure similar to that used in appointing the members of the Joint Maritime Commission. In the case of the coal-mining committee, for instance, this would involve waiting until a special coal Conference was held and asking the Employers' and Workers' delegates at that Conference to appoint their representatives to the coal-mining industrial committee. This procedure, however, would involve very great delay. At least eight to ten years would be required for all the various committees to be set up as a result of special sessions of the International Labour Conference. Moreover, such Conferences would not meet very often and the panel elected would soon become out of date. This had happened in the case of the Joint Maritime Commission, which was elected in 1936, so that when it was desired to call a meeting of the Commission the few surviving members had to co-opt new members to make up the full membership. This procedure was hardly satisfactory.

Another conceivable system was for the Governing Body, for instance, to choose the members of the industrial committees. It was difficult, however, to see how the Governing Body could determine which was the most representative trade union
organisation for the industry concerned within a Member State. All that the Governing Body could do would be to refer to the representatives of the Governments concerned who happened to be sitting on the Governing Body, so that the procedure would really amount to having the members appointed by the Governments themselves. If there were any dispute between two organisations of comparatively equal importance the Governing Body's decision might give rise to difficulties, and it would therefore be preferable for the Governing Body not to take any responsibility in respect of such matters, which were purely a domestic issue.

In the case of certain industries there were what were called international trade secretariats, and these might conceivably be asked to nominate at least the workers' members of the appropriate industrial committees. The problem of finding some procedure for appointing the employers' members would remain. Here again the system would not be wholly satisfactory, because the membership of the trade secretariats varied from time to time and they covered only certain countries.

After examining all these possibilities, the Office had concluded that the most practical solution was to ask the Governments of the countries concerned to appoint the employers' and workers' members in agreement with the most representative organisation in the industry concerned.

The Governing Body would remember that in discussing the 1945 budget at Philadelphia, special provision had been made for work connected with industrial committees.

Sir John Forbes Watson said that one of the most important decisions which the Governing Body would have to take was that which referred to the composition of the industrial committees; whether they were to be bipartite, consisting of employers and workers, or tripartite, including also representatives of Governments. What was proposed was in fact the extension to other industries of the method of negotiation which had proved successful in the case of the shipping industry.

The Chairman had called attention to the fact that after a lively discussion, the Joint Maritime Commission had succeeded in reaching agreement. That had been possible only because the shipowners and seamen were skilled in that type of negotiation and because they had been left alone to find their own solutions without outside interference.

Just over a year ago the Minister of Labour and National Service of Great Britain, in addressing the Governing Body, had referred to the importance of extending to other industries the system operating in the shipping industry. Like Mr. Bevin, he believed in trade unionism on both sides of industry, and he believed that voluntary collective bargaining between employers and workers had been a decisive factor in welding the British people together during the war.

At the opening of the present session of the Governing Body the Minister of Labour and National Service had again stressed the desirability of bringing together employers and workers engaged in the same trade to discuss their common problems. The Employers' group wholeheartedly supported this development. He noticed however that the Office note tended to support the idea that the industrial committees should be tripartite. Great Britain had had wide experience of collective bargaining, but Sir Frederick Leggett would bear him out in saying that the Government had intervened only when employers and workers had failed to settle their affairs alone. What had been done nationally in Great Britain should now be done internationally; that is to say, the workers and employers in the various industries should be given the opportunity of solving their problems through voluntary negotiation. He himself believed that the results would have been much less satisfactory in Great Britain if the Government had intervened during the first stage of collective negotiations.

It was pointed out in the Office note that there were no employers' and workers' organisations in certain countries. He thought that this was an additional reason for encouraging the setting up of such organisations in those countries. This could be done if the Governments asked the employers and workers to choose their representatives to examine their problems nationally and internationally and try to reach agreement.
He anticipated most successful results from the setting up of industrial committees within the Organisation if employers and workers were left to settle their problems between themselves. If Governments came in at the very beginning it would not be a case of discussions between those who knew the problems of the industry thoroughly, because the Government representatives would look at the matter from another angle, and this would affect the results.

At the 91st Session of the Governing Body Sir Frederick Leggett had stressed the effectiveness of negotiations between the responsible representatives of an industry, as in the case of the Joint Maritime Commission. He had suggested that the Organisation should try to reach decisions by negotiation and conciliation between the parties rather than by the votes of third parties, and had expressed the view that the future success of the Organisation would depend on its power to provide employers and workers with the means to discuss their problems internationally as they discussed them nationally.

The report of the Joint Maritime Commission showed what a degree of harmony could be reached in the solution of the problems of an industry. There was no need to fear that the employers and workers would make agreements damaging to the general consumer, because the reports of committees such as the Joint Maritime Commission had to come before the Governing Body, which decided on the action to be taken.

There were, of course, cases where Governments were directly interested. The Joint Maritime Commission had suggested a method of meeting this position; with regard to social insurance for seamen it had recommended that special committees should be set up on which Governments would be represented, and with regard to safety at sea it had proposed that the matter should be dealt with by a diplomatic conference.

If, instead of following the pattern of the Joint Maritime Commission, which had proved its value, another method was chosen for the composition of the industrial committees, it would no longer be a question of building up internationally a system which had been successful nationally, but of arranging for a series of technical tripartite conferences such as had been held in Geneva in the past and had produced no practical results. This had been the case in the coal-mining industry and in the textile industry.

The Employers' group would wholeheartedly support a method which would enable employers and workers in the various industries to get together and discuss their common problems. The composition of the industrial committees should be bipartite. If the negotiations failed, it would be time enough for the Governments to intervene.

If it was agreed that the industrial committees were to be bipartite he did not think that any difficulty would arise in connection with the other points, but if they were to be tripartite it would be extremely difficult to settle the other points. He urged most earnestly that at the present stage at least the industrial committees should be confined to employers and workers who would be called upon to discuss internationally matters with which they were thoroughly familiar.

Sir Frederick Leggett thought that it would be useful to explain more fully what the British Government intended the industrial committees to do.

In considering methods of developing and strengthening the activities of the Organisation, Mr. Bevin had come to the conclusion that it would be desirable to bring together, under the auspices of the Organisation, the employers and workers in various industries who were bound together by a common experience and a common love for their occupation, irrespective of their nationality. This might lead to the shaping of an instrument for bringing about greater understanding between the peoples of different countries and for dissipating the widespread ignorance of the people of one country about the way in which the people of other countries lived.

The object was primarily to promote conditions favourable to world peace, and only secondarily to settle conditions of employment internationally. The British Government therefore considered that the committees should consist of employers and workers only, since Governments already had ample connections between each other.

Furthermore, while the meetings of the International Labour Organisation had given an opportunity to the leaders of trade unions and employers' organisations of
various countries to come together, it was surprising how little was known in each country about the work of the Organisation and how slender was the connection between the ordinary worker and the operations of the International Labour Office. It was desired to give the workers in each industry the feeling that they had a direct interest in the work of the Organisation, and that would come about if representatives from each industry took part in meetings called by the Organisation and reported back to those who had sent them. This procedure might be slow, but he thought that it would be effective.

He thought that if the matter were considered from that point of view the industrial committees should be bipartite, on the understanding that when subjects come up for discussion on which Governments could supply experts the committees might become tripartite. If the committees were to be tripartite from the start it would be necessary to decide which Governments should be represented on each committee. This would inevitably lead to a process of bargaining, because some Governments would claim a seat on one committee because another Government was represented on another committee.

It had been pointed out that on the Joint Maritime Commission the two parties had persisted in their negotiations until they reached agreement. If third parties had been present and had produced a decision by voting, it was improbable that that decision would have been more effective or more likely to have been put into operation than an agreement reached after hard discussion between the two sides.

The industrial committees would not have to take any constitutional decisions; any conclusions that they reached would be referred to the Governing Body or to the Conference under the normal constitutional procedure. There was no question of setting up within the Organisation bodies competing with the International Labour Conference or with the Governing Body.

*Mr. Hallsworth* said that the Workers' group was unanimously in favour of basing the industrial committees on the tripartite principle. He hoped that a sufficient number of members of the Government group would be converted to this view to enable it to prevail.

It was not only the Workers' group of the Governing Body which was in favour of tripartite industrial committees. The British Trades Union Congress, which represented seven million members, had also unanimously expressed itself in favour of the tripartite principle. Moreover, three of the most prominent international trade secretariats, namely, the Miners' International Federation, the International Transport Workers' Federation, and the Metal Trades International Federation, had all declared in favour of the tripartite principle. On the workers' side, therefore, there was no opinion in favour of the setting up of bipartite industrial committees.

It was true that the only industrial committee in existence within the Organisation, the Joint Maritime Commission, was bipartite; but in the light of their experience of the working of that Commission the Workers' group as a whole had asked for its conversion into a tripartite Commission.

He fully agreed with Sir Frederick Leggett with regard to the necessity of spreading a knowledge of the work of the Organisation within the various industries, since it was mainly the leaders of the employers' and workers' organisations who took part in the meetings of the Organisation. Only when the workers of the various countries felt that they were playing some part in the Organisation would the latter be able to achieve its full objectives.

It was clear that at some stage the Governments would have to play an important part in the work which would be done through the industrial committees, and it would therefore certainly be better for them to be associated with that work from the beginning rather than to come in at the end. In some cases it might well be found that when the Government was brought in it was necessary to start all over again. With regard to the Joint Maritime Commission, the conversion of the Commission into a tripartite Commission, which the seafarers had strongly urged, had always been opposed by the shipowners. This was one point on which no agreement had been reached by the Commission. Both sides of the Commission, however, had agreed that it might often be useful for committees to be appointed to consider
matters referred to them by the Commission, and that these committees might be bipartisan or tripartite as was thought appropriate in each case. This agreement had already been acted upon when it was decided to set up special committees to consider two groups of subjects.

Conversely, it might be suggested that if the industrial committees were on a tripartite basis specific questions might upon occasion be referred to meetings composed of employers and workers only with a view to hammering out a solution. In any case, it should always be remembered that, even if the employers and workers reached agreement, the Governments might have to intervene at a given moment because of economic or political considerations which might affect the implementation of any agreement reached between the parties.

While agreeing with Sir Frederick Leggett on a number of points, therefore, the Workers' group had no hesitation in declaring itself in favour of establishing the committees on a tripartite basis. They were, however, prepared to agree that specific questions might be referred to meetings confined to employers and workers who would submit proposals for consideration by the tripartite committee as a whole.

Mr. Hjelmtveit said that the Norwegian Government fully supported the proposal to set up industrial committees within given industries of an international character. Such committees would be of great help to the work of the Organisation in the field of economic and social improvement in different industries. It had been said that the Organisation too often dealt with generalities, and the establishment of industrial committees would help to remove this disadvantage. Problems would be dealt with in a more detailed and realistic manner because the members of the committees would have an intimate personal knowledge of the industries concerned. The committees would also help to disseminate a knowledge of the Organisation's work and increase interest in it in the various countries.

He suggested that national committees similar to the international committees should also be set up, and direct co-operation should be organised between the national and international committees.

The Norwegian Government was in favour of setting up the committees on a tripartite basis, which was in accordance with the principles of the Organisation and which enabled the public interest to be voiced through the Government representatives. He thought that the principle of Government participation in the reorganisation of industry would be increasingly applied after the war, and an industrial committee without Government representation would therefore be incomplete. The tripartite principle need not, however, be so rigidly applied as to exclude the establishment of bipartisan technical subcommittees.

The Norwegian Government wished Norway to participate in several of the committees, and the representatives of Norwegian employers and workers concurred in this desire. He was glad to note that Norway had been proposed as a member of the European Inland Transport Committee and the Shipbuilding Committee. Norway would also appreciate membership of the Textile Committee, since the textile industry now played a relatively important part in the economic and industrial life of Norway and employed a large number of workers.

With regard to the enlargement of the scope of the committees, he wished to emphasise the importance of the wood and pulp industry, especially in the Scandinavian countries and in the Soviet Union, a country which he hoped would again become a Member of the Organisation. Among the other industries mentioned by the Office, he wished to emphasise the importance of the chemical industry. If a committee for this industry was established, Norway, which had a particular interest in the electrochemical industry, would wish to be represented on it.

The industrial committees would deal with wages, labour conditions and other matters in each of the industries concerned. He wished to call attention to the fact that there were certain kinds of work which were common to a number of industries, such as clerical work and motor transport. He assumed that the committees would deal with problems which were typical of the industries concerned; problems common to several industries might be dealt with by a special committee which would co-ordinate the work of the various industrial committees.
At the present time it was practically impossible to consult representatives of Norwegian industries, and therefore to ascertain the committees on which they would wish to be represented. Such consultation could take place only after the liberation of the country, and the question of Norway’s participation in the committees must therefore be reserved for the time being.

Mr. Dahl said that, while the Norwegian employers’ organisations agreed in general with the views expressed by Mr. Hjelmtveit, the Norwegian employers were in favour of industrial committees on a bipartite basis.

Mr. McDavitt thought that the degree of nationalisation of industry which was sometimes regarded as a possibility for the future had not yet been reached, and that this being so, the International Labour Organisation should do all it could to help workers and employers to learn to solve their problems between themselves and not to rely on Governments to make decisions for them.

He heartily agreed with Sir John Forbes Watson and with the Employers’ group as a whole with regard to the composition of the industrial committees. After many years of experience, he had come to feel very strongly that, at least at the preliminary stage of negotiations in respect of industrial relations, it was desirable not to include Government representatives, who in effect would play the part of arbitrators. In expressing that feeling he thought that he reflected the predominant feeling of the industrialists of his country. The intervention of arbitrators often had the effect of encouraging unyielding positions on both sides, and in his opinion it was much better to give the parties principally concerned the opportunity of making an effort to reach agreement; the Governments could be called in if agreement proved impossible. For many years he had been urging employers to recognise trade unions in a spirit of conciliation and with the will to reach agreement. He therefore wanted the two sides in industry to be given the opportunity of meeting in order to negotiate agreements, and not to have their problems settled by Government intervention, except in certain circumstances, as indicated by the report of the Joint Maritime Commission.

Incidentally, he thought that a bipartite set-up of the industrial committees would help to stimulate interest in freedom of association in those countries in which it did not yet exist. He supported all the arguments put forward by Sir Frederick Leggett in favour of the bipartite composition of industrial committees.

Mr. Lombardo Toledano said that the proposed industrial committees would deal with both social and economic problems, and that it was therefore necessary to bear in mind the effects, both national and international, of the setting up and operation of such committees. Any arrangement concerning the form of operation of a given industry was an integral part of economic policy, and at the present stage of world economic development he did not think that the workers and employers alone were in a position to work out a national economic policy, still less an international economic policy, without the participation of Governments.

Apart from secondary considerations, such as the extent to which the workers of certain countries could effectively be represented on the industrial committees through their organisations, he wished to call the Governing Body’s attention to a fundamental aspect of the problem which related to the interests of the peoples, and especially of the workers, of the Latin American countries and of other comparatively underdeveloped countries throughout the world.

The non-intervention of the State in matters relating to the social and economic policy of the weak or underdeveloped countries would be tantamount to placing these countries at the mercy of the foreign monopolies which had capital invested in them. A hundred years of experience had shown that whenever the State had failed to intervene in matters relating to the economic development of the Latin American countries, undertakings, and especially foreign companies, refused to enter into any negotiations with labour which might lead to the solution of a given problem.

In the Latin American countries social progress was essentially a national problem, and with very few exceptions the workers and the Governments of those countries, throughout their long history, had been associated in a common effort of national
Statistics proved that, failing social legislation and a State social policy in any country, the standard of living of the people was invariably very low.

From a more general standpoint, the omission of Governments from the industrial committees would be in flagrant contradiction to the Atlantic Charter and to the whole policy of close collaboration between Governments, which alone could ensure peace and prosperity in the post-war world. This collaboration would have to be essentially economic, and would also have to be reflected in international collaboration in the social field. Further, there was a great contradiction between the laissez-faire theory of relations between employers and workers and the policy of international economic and social co-ordination for the post-war period.

A brief summary of the development of contractual relations between workers and employers in Latin America might be useful. The first stage had led from the individual contract to the collective agreement, and during that period the social life of the Latin American countries had been stormy. The second stage had led from the collective agreement applicable to a single undertaking to the collective agreement applicable to several undertakings in the same industry; this again was characterised by constant and violent struggles. The third stage, which was still in progress, was characterised by the transition from the voluntary collective agreement to the compulsory collective agreement applicable to an entire industry as a result of agreement between the State, the workers and the employers. This stage was marked by the efforts of labour to secure a revision of contracts of employment, which, generally speaking, had been crowned with success.

All the collective agreements regulating labour conditions in the most important industries of Latin America had been the result of tripartite agreements. It should be remembered that the whole of world social legislation was based on the intervention of the State in the national economy. Labour legislation began at the point where the State intervened between employers and workers and not before.

He thought that the International Labour Organisation could hardly advocate the establishment of bipartite organisations, because they would be in contradiction to the very nature and essence of the Organisation and would undermine its structure.

Mr. Hauck wished to deal with the question of industrial committees from the standpoint of a country which, after having its territory ravaged by military operations, had endured enemy occupation for four years, and since its liberation was still experiencing grave difficulties.

France, and the other countries which were in the same position, naturally tended to look at economic and social problems from the angle of their immediate needs and of European and world reconstruction.

A very favourable reception had been given in France to the proposal to set up international industrial committees, which could play a very useful part in connection with the great work of reconstruction. He therefore hoped that practical results would be obtained in this field in the very near future.

With regard to the choice of the industries for which committees should be set up, in addition to coal mining and shipbuilding he wished to call attention to the very urgent problem of inland transport, which was the most serious problem facing Europe at the present time.

Similarly, in view of the devastation caused by the war, it was essential to consider the setting up without delay of a committee for the building and public works industry.

The French Government was very definitely in favour of establishing the committees on a tripartite basis. In the course of the discussion on constitutional reform, special emphasis had been laid on the great importance of the tripartite structure of the Organisation, and nothing should be done to weaken it. The Governing Body should avoid giving the impression of contradicting itself by setting up bodies which were not tripartite. Furthermore, if it was desired to prevent the International Labour Organisation from being made subordinate to a body which was not tripartite, but purely governmental in character, in the future world organisation, the presence of Governments on the industrial committees would undoubtedly enable certain possible difficulties to be more easily solved.

The Acting Director had recently pointed out to the Governing Body the disad-
vantages of reducing the number of Government representatives within the Organisation, mainly from the standpoint of the ratification of Conventions.

It would, moreover, be impracticable at the present time to set up effective committees if Governments were not to take part in their work. Whether it was a question of transport, coal mining, the metal trades, or building, the public authorities were bound to intervene. It was impossible to envisage the economic rehabilitation of Europe without the participation of Governments. This was not a question of theory; practical necessity required that the economy should be planned, that the State should play a major part in the economic life of nations, and that economic and social problems should no longer be separated.

He noted that even those who were in favour of bipartite industrial committees recognised that it might often be necessary to call in the Governments. That being so, it seemed preferable for Governments to be associated in the work of the industrial committees from the outset. In a world disorganised by war, and in which there were so many divergent interests, it was essential for the public authorities to take control and act as arbitrators as the representatives of the public interest.

Finally he wished to sound a warning against the danger of trying to rebuild an economic or social structure similar to that which totalitarian countries had tried to establish on the Continent. Under different forms, in Germany, and especially in Italy and in France under the Vichy régime, attempts had been made to set up a corporative system under the pretext of associating employers and workers without State interference. This had developed a corporative selfishness which put trade interests above the public interest.

He considered that the most practical method of selecting the members of the industrial committees would be to have them appointed by the Governments. In order that the committees might do effective work it was also important that the members should have a direct mandate from the employers and workers of the various countries.

Mr. Lubin thought that the discussion was in a sense premature. It was impossible to say whether the committees should be tripartite or bipartite until their functions had been defined. But since the question had been raised, he would like to state the attitude of the United States Government towards it. He did not believe that those who advocated the tripartite system intended that the Governments should make decisions for industry and labour. Wherever industry and labour could agree on labour conditions through collective bargaining, whether nationally or internationally, no Government would want to interfere with such agreements except in so far as they were against the public interest.

In any case, he thought that the ultimate decision as to whether or not effect should be given to a specified policy in a specified country must in the last analysis be made by the Government itself.

Because certain countries had fairly wide organisations of employers and workers, it must not be assumed that this was the case in all countries. It was undoubtedly true that if an agreement were made between organised workers and organised employers, the number of workers who would not be subject to the agreement would be far greater than the number who would be subject to it.

It had been pointed out that the employers and workers would not necessarily reach decisions at their meetings. If that were so, there seemed to be no reason why Government experts should not be present, so that they might learn something from the technical information about a given industry which was contributed by both sides or contribute information of their own.

There was nothing in the Constitution of the Organisation or in the Standing Orders to prevent the employers' and workers' representatives on the Governing Body or at the International Labour Conference from meeting to see if they could reach agreement. If they had been anxious to get together in order to solve the problems dealt with by the International Labour Conference, they would have had ample opportunity to do so without the presence of Governments, but so far they had done nothing of the kind.
In short, the United States Government thought that neither the employers nor the workers nor the Governments should be prevented, in any activity of the International Labour Organisation, from taking part not only in making decisions but in the deliberations and recommendations. If the employers or the workers felt at any time that bipartite meetings should be held, they were fully entitled to hold them and to frame recommendations, and these would no doubt save time in the subsequent discussions.

Mr. Fuss thought that the Governing Body had seldom had an item of such importance on its agenda. What was proposed was the setting up of a new procedure to determine international labour standards. He did not think that this procedure need necessarily lead up to decisions taken either by the Governing Body or by the International Labour Conference.

There were in the various countries, in addition to labour legislation, collective agreements which had no legal sanction and in which the Government took no part, but which in many cases were of greater practical importance than the laws and regulations themselves. It was conceivable that in the international field too the work of the industrial committees might lead to the building up, side by side with Conventions and Recommendations, of a kind of international law on custom in labour matters arising out of free agreements between employers' and workers' representatives. Any decision taken by the industrial committees would, however, inevitably concern Governments, because they might affect not only labour conditions but the economic position of various industries.

It had been pointed out that any decisions taken by bipartite industrial committees would in any case be laid before the Governing Body, which included representatives of Governments. He thought, however, that for the sake of gaining time and speeding up the procedure, it would be better for the Governments to be represented on the industrial committees themselves.

He would like to put forward a suggestion which he thought might command general agreement. The industrial committees might be on a tripartite basis, but the workers' representatives and the employers' representatives might hold a preliminary exchange of views at the beginning of each session. If they came to an agreement the Government representatives attending the closing part of the session would have the opportunity of satisfying themselves that the agreement was not contrary to the more general interests which they were responsible for guarding, and the agreement would be confirmed by the full committee. Failing agreement between the employers' and workers' members of the committee, the Government representatives might intervene as conciliators. In this way each committee would be bipartite at the beginning of its sessions and tripartite at the end of them.

Mr. Watt thought that the very fact that the present discussion was taking place in the Governing Body seemed to indicate that in the field of industrial relations the point had not yet been reached where such problems could be solved by the bipartite method. This was true even in the case of highly industrialised countries like the United States and Great Britain, and it was even more true of less advanced countries.

Nevertheless he thought that the objective aimed at by Sir John Forbes Watson and Sir Frederick Leggett was in itself laudable. Most workers in the United States desired that the Government should interfere as little as possible in industrial relations, and viewed with much concern the possibility of a system in which the social and economic controls would be in the hands of men elected for their political ability.

Government intervention was still necessary because that state of mutual understanding between employers and workers which would enable agreement to be reached in every case had not yet been attained. Progress in mutual understanding had, however, been made during the war.

He agreed with Mr. Hjelmtveit's suggestion that national industrial committees complementary to the international committees should be set up. The national committees might be bipartite in character, at least in the countries in which industrial organisation was more advanced.

In conclusion, he thought that both employers and workers should recognise
that they were not yet in a position to dispense entirely with Government co-operation in this field.

Mr. Downes supported Mr. Hallsworth's statement in favour of setting up industrial committees on a tripartite basis, on behalf of the workers of a country which hoped to take part in the work of the committees.

He did not think that too close an analogy should be drawn between national bipartite negotiations and the functions of the international industrial committees which it was proposed to set up. The establishment of these committees would in no way interfere with industrial relations in the domestic field; on the contrary, it would probably develop a tendency towards the constitution of national committees to facilitate the appointment of the employers' and workers' representatives on the international industrial committees.

Furthermore, the tripartite character of the international industrial committees would no doubt enable the procedure to be speeded up, because the views of the Governments would be represented from the very beginning of the negotiations and it would not be necessary to wait for their intervention at a later stage.

The sitting closed at 6.05 p.m.

Carter Goodrich.
MINUTES OF THE EIGHTH SITTING

(Tuesday, 30 January 1945 — 10.15 a.m.)

The Governing Body was composed as follows: Mr. Goodrich (Chairman), Mr. Aghnides, Mr. Antoine, Mr. Bengough, Mr. Bianchi, Mr. Chapa, Mr. Chu Hsieh-fan, Mrs. Clegg Riedel, Mr. Dahl, Mr. England, Mr. Erulkar, Sir John Forbes Watson, Mr. Fuss, Mr. Gemmill, Mr. Gouthier, Mr. Hallsworth, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Hjelmtveit, Mr. Kosina, Mr. Kovacevich, Mr. Laurent, Mr. Lecocq, Sir Frederick Leggett, Mr. Li Ping-heng, Mr. Lombardo Toledano, Mr. Martin, Mr. McDavid, Mr. Oldenbroek, Mr. del Río y Cañedo, Mr. Stanczyk, Mr. Watt.

Absent: Mr. Alvarado.

Third Item on the Agenda

Proposals concerning Industrial Committees (continued)

General Discussion (continued).

Mr. Oldenbroek hoped that the Governing Body would be able to come to definite and concrete decisions without delay.

He believed that the industrial committees would provide machinery for the improvement of working conditions and would help to give practical effect to the principles of the Declaration of Philadelphia, especially in the economic sphere. It had already been suggested that the industrial committees should co-operate closely with the Employment Committee, since the question of full employment and the raising of standards of living must be dealt with by the several industries and could not be tackled only as problems of general interest.

It was hardly necessary to add fresh arguments in favour of the tripartite structure of industrial committees. Nevertheless, he wished to point out that it would be greatly to the interest of the Governments themselves to know the views of the representatives of the other two groups on the industrial committees, so that they might frame their policy accordingly.

He thought that it would not be advisable to bring the Governments in only at the final stage of the work of the committees. The Government representatives should participate not as arbitrators, but on an equal footing with representatives of the other groups in order to try to arrive at common conclusions.

It had been argued that the Joint Maritime Commission, which was on a bipartite basis, had been able to produce very satisfactory results. Personally he was of the opinion that in many cases the Commission had been a failure, and that it would have produced much better results if its composition had been different. The question of the regulation of hours, for instance, had had to be discussed from 1920 to 1935 before any results were obtained, and even then these results fell short of what was necessary to cope with the situation at that time. If the Commission had been tripartite it would have been possible from the very first to draw Governments into the discussion of the measures which were already necessary in 1920.

If the Governments wished to participate in the industrial committees he saw no reason to keep them out. Their presence would provide the opportunity of telling them at the proper moment what was expected of them. Governments had their own task in such matters, and the object of the committees was precisely to make it possible for them to take account of the views of the other groups which emerged from the common discussions. It was obvious that neither the problems of economic policy, nor even problems of working conditions could be settled by employers and workers alone.
This was not, as had been suggested, because the two sides might solve their problems at the expense of the community. The influence of the employers was always exerted to cut down the benefits claimed by the workers, and they would never accept solutions which would in any way prejudice the interests of the consumers.

He hoped that the industrial committees would start work soon. With regard to the Inland Transport Committee, he did not think that its scope should be confined to European transport, although it ought to consider the European situation first. It was urgently necessary to deal with the very serious disorganisation of transport in Europe, and this was a task to which employers and workers could make a very useful contribution.

Mr. Gouthier said that the Brazilian Government was very favourably disposed towards the proposal to set up industrial committees, as towards any measure which would be of benefit to the workers, directly or indirectly. There appeared to be general agreement with the proposals laid before the Governing Body, except in respect of the composition of the committees.

The Brazilian Government favoured the participation of Governments in the committees. As Mr. Lombardo Toledano had pointed out, in many countries it was due to the initiative of the Governments that progress had been made in labour legislation, and this was also the case in Brazil.

The facts had proved that the presence of Governments often helped employers and workers to agree. Moreover, Governments were responsible for the welfare of the people, in other words, not only of the workers but of the employers.

He thought that present conditions in Europe were an additional reason for setting up the industrial committees on a tripartite basis.

Another point to which he wished to call the Governing Body's attention was the desirability of establishing an industrial committee for air transport. Because of the great expansion of civil aviation it was necessary to give careful consideration to the peculiar conditions of work in air transport. No international legislation could protect that personnel against the risks involved in flying, but an air transport committee could secure satisfactory working conditions for them.

Mr. Paul Martin thought that the debate was one of the greatest importance, especially from the standpoint of his own country. Canada was one of the most important industrial nations and a country in which trade unionism had grown very rapidly since the beginning of the war; there had been an increase in trade union membership from 300,000 to 700,000.

He thought that the original proposal put forward by the United Kingdom Government, which Sir Frederick Leggett had again explained, was not quite the same as the proposal which the Office had laid before the Governing Body. Sir Frederick Leggett had said that it was desirable to convene employers and workers on the international level for the mere purpose of exchanging views, in the hope that this would result in bringing about a better understanding between employers and workers. The Office had contemplated something much more extensive; in discussing the nature of the decisions of the committees, after mentioning the exchanges of views suggested by Sir Frederick Leggett, the Office note suggested that, as the committees developed, they might arrive at decisions assuming a variety of forms, several examples being given.

Both the proposal of Sir Frederick Leggett and that of the Office were very commendable in the eyes of the Canadian Government. On the American continent, and especially in Canada, labour in particular, Governments to a lesser extent, and employers occasionally, had expressed a desire for the formation of industrial councils. Some regarded this proposal as very dangerous and as likely to result in some form of economic or political totalitarianism; others regarded it as liable to hasten the nationalisation of industry. The Government of Canada would like to see the question approached frankly, and thought that the best way of bringing into the open the problems which affected workers, employers and Governments would be to put into effect the proposals which were now before the Governing Body.
The present conception of industry was that of a partnership between many elements, of which the State was one. As the committees which it was proposed to establish were to meet under the auspices of the International Labour Organisation it would be wrong to exclude Governments, although it might be possible to arrange for meetings at which Governments would not be present.

Generally speaking, the presence of Governments appeared to be essential. For one reason, they must be able to indicate to the employers and workers the real difficulties attached to the exercise of governmental responsibility; while on the other hand, the contact of Government representatives with employers and workers would help the Governments to understand more intimately the problems of the two groups.

The creation of industrial committees was a new departure which was capable of having widespread effects both nationally and internationally. Before considering the extension of the system to a whole series of industries, however, it would no doubt be wiser to reach a more definite conception of the composition and functions of the committees. A start might be made with a few industries in which wide participation by employers and workers was assured, together with Government representatives. This would make it possible to make a practical and sound start in a new field which promised most satisfactory results.

Mr. England said that the Government of India accepted in principle the proposals laid before the Governing Body, but it considered that no action should be taken in the case of India during wartime.

The Government of India considered that at the outset the industries to be covered should be coal-mining, textiles, iron and steel production, and chemicals, and that, except in the case of coal-mining, the committees should not be confined to European industries. The agenda of the committees should be on broad lines and confined in the main to social problems.

Since 1942 the Government of India had established a tripartite labour conference on the model of the Organisation. With regard to the composition of the committees, therefore, the Government of India would prefer a system which embodied suitable safeguards for the preservation of the tripartite principle.

Mrs. Clegg Riedel said that at a time when the more industrialised part of the Netherlands was still under German occupation and when the free employers' and workers' organisations in the liberated part were only just beginning to resume their activities, it was impossible for her Government to make a very definite contribution to the discussion. She would therefore confine herself to saying that even before the invasion the general trend of public opinion was moving in the direction of favouring increased Government participation in the conduct of social and economic affairs, in order to ensure the highest possible level of social welfare. This trend had been strengthened during the war, and it was generally held today that without vigorous action by the public authorities the problems raised by the devastation and looting which the Netherlands had suffered would be almost insoluble. The necessity for Government action would be especially acute in the transition period, and as the agenda suggested for the industrial committees included the problems of the transition period, she thought that it was important that Governments, as well as workers and employers, should be represented on the committees from the outset. Otherwise the decisions of the committees, taken independently of Governments, would only add to the difficulties of co-ordinating social policy in that critical period.

The Netherlands Government was in general agreement with the list of industries proposed to the Governing Body. With regard to coal-mining, while it was obviously desirable to envisage a wider international committee, the problems of the coal-mining industry in Europe required immediate action.

Sir Frederick Legget thought that the debate on this very important question had been on a very high level. Coming from a country which had a longer tradition
of trade organisation and of voluntary negotiations between employers and workers, and which believed that democracy depended on Government decentralisation, it was natural that he should have suggested in the first place that the committees should be composed of employers and workers with an independent chairman. It had become clear from the discussion, however, that in nearly all other countries the Government must take a leading part in the settlement of industrial and social conditions. This might be a matter for congratulation or regret. But in any case it was desirable to encourage the organisation of employers and workers, for in his own country some concern was felt at the prospect of putting too much power in the hands of a central Government.

He was, however, prepared to accept the general view of the Governing Body that Governments should be represented on the industrial committees. The question of how they should be represented remained to be decided, and no very definite conclusion on this point had emerged from the discussion. Nevertheless, it had been made clear that in setting up the committees there was no intention of interfering in any way with the present Constitution of the Organisation; in other words, the only body which could come to decisions involving Government responsibility was the International Labour Conference. The fact that Government representatives sat on the industrial committees would not therefore lead to the taking of decisions which could go directly to Governments or which had any constitutionally binding force.

On the other hand, it was generally contemplated that, as a result of the meetings of the committees, some matters would be referred back to the several countries, where the employers and workers, perhaps in association with the Government, would take action along the lines recommended by the committee. In other cases the committees would report back to the Governing Body, which would take the necessary action on any agreed proposals, and which might follow up certain suggestions made in the committee by one or other of the groups, even if there had not been agreement on the committee.

So far, the suggestions made in the course of the debate would meet with no objection from the British Government, but that Government could not agree that the industrial committees should take any decisions which would have an effect similar to the decisions of the International Labour Conference.

He thought therefore that if Governments were to be represented on the industrial committees, there should be no question of their having votes. The function of Government representatives should be to supply expert assistance, and the qualified experts sent by Governments should change with the subject discussed. If the Government representatives had a vote, the effect would be to weaken the discussion and to cause each side to state an extreme case, leaving it to the Government vote to settle the issue. The aim of the industrial committees should be to reconcile the views of the employers and workers to the utmost extent possible in order to find a recommendation acceptable to both sides.

He would therefore bow to the views of the majority of the Governing Body that there should be Government representation on the committees, provided that such representation should not result in cutting down discussion or, as it were, imposing Government decisions.

Methods of Appointing Employers' and Workers' Representatives.

The Chairman said that as the general discussion was now closed, the Governing Body would have to take a series of decisions on the basis of the proposals put forward by the Office.

The first of these decisions was the determination of the method of appointing the employers' and workers' representatives on the committees. The proposal made by the Office was, in substance, to leave to the Government of each country the responsibility for appointing the workers' and employers' members of the committees in agreement with the principal organisations of employers and workers having a substantial membership engaged in the industry.

Mr. Lubin said that the Government of the United States realised that it would be impossible to select the members of the industrial committees through the system
of electoral colleges. The situation might be different after the committees had been under way for some time and it was possible to define the boundaries of each industry more accurately.

The system of electoral colleges had not been able to operate normally owing to the war, but he wished to state that the United States Government was entirely dissatisfied with the methods used in the selection of members of the Joint Maritime Commission which had met recently. Because of the war and of the impossibility of reaching some of the members, extreme measures had to be applied, but the manner in which they were applied did not meet with the satisfaction of the Government of the United States. In order to avoid any possible repetition of this difficulty, his Government was definitely in favour of the method of appointing members of the industrial committees which the Chairman had just described, and which was similar to the method used in selecting the delegates to the International Labour Conference.

Mr. Hallsworth said that the Workers' group had come to a unanimous decision with regard to the method of appointing the employers' and workers' representatives on the industrial committees. To quote Great Britain as an example, no method of appointment could be contemplated different from that which was used in appointing the workers' delegate to the International Labour Conference and his advisers. The fact that in Great Britain there was a united trade union centre had made it possible to use the same method for the selection not only of the workers' delegation to the International Labour Conference but also of delegates and advisers on Government committees. Whatever particular industrial committees might be established, therefore, the workers of Great Britain would insist that the Government should appoint the workers' representatives on the basis of nominations secured through the British Trades Union Congress. The Trades Union Congress would be responsible for consulting the trade unions in the various industries and for passing on the nominations submitted by them.

There were, for instance, in the engineering and allied trades in Great Britain some 30 unions affiliated to the Trades Union Congress. It was, therefore, only through the intermediary of the Trades Union Congress that the Government could secure the nominations for appointments to the industrial committees.

The Workers' group was also unanimously in favour of the suggestion that wherever possible national committees should be appointed to work in close association with the international industrial committees.

The Acting Director did not think that the text of the Office note excluded the procedure the importance of which Mr. Hallsworth had just emphasised, but if necessary the wording could be revised. As Mr. Hallsworth had said, Great Britain was in the fortunate position of having almost all its trade unions affiliated to one central organisation, and in those circumstances it was clearly the most efficacious procedure for the Government to find the representatives for one particular industry through nominations submitted through the Trades Union Congress. There were, however, other countries where there was no general central organisation and where the Government would necessarily have to apply to the trade organisations directly concerned. The intention of the Office had been to leave Governments free to use the most representative organisations to secure nominations for membership of the industrial committees.

Sir John Forbes Watson thought that the first question to be decided was the fundamental one of whether the composition of the committees was to be bipartite or tripartite. This decision might determine the attitude of some members of the Governing Body towards the other points which had to be settled. Furthermore, the functions of the committees ought also to be defined before the method of appointing the members was considered.

He noticed that in the section of the Office note entitled "Agenda" it was stated that:

The committees are designed primarily as an instrument of co-operation between their employer and worker members, and until they have themselves worked out programmes of future action which indicate the assistance which
the Office can give in the future development of their work, the Office can do little more than make arrangements to bring together the parties concerned.

He thought this definition of the functions of the committees was very important, and gave the debate an entirely new aspect.

It was also important to examine the list of countries which it was proposed to convene to the meetings of the industrial committees. These countries included Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway and Yugoslavia, and there could be no question of convening their representatives to sit on the industrial committees at the present time.

With regard to the appointment of the employers' and workers' representatives, he was quite willing to accept that this should be done by the Governments under the conditions suggested in the Office note. In Great Britain this procedure would be facilitated by the existence of a central employers' organisation, which would forward the proposals made by the industries concerned which were affiliated to it.

The question of Government participation arose not only in respect of the international committees, but also in respect of the national committees to which Mr. Hallsworth had referred. Even if the Governments were represented on the international committees, he would fight tooth and nail against national committees working with them, because it would mean that sooner or later Governments would intervene in the domestic discussions between employers and workers, and when the Government came in at the door negotiations flew out of the window.

Sir Frederick Leggett said that it was important to settle the question of Government participation at once because the decision would make all the difference to the work which could be done immediately after the Governing Body session. The British Government could not accept the responsibility of appointing the employers' and workers' representatives to the industrial committees. What it would be prepared to do was to act as the medium through which the nominations could be sent. There was a difference between the appointment of members of industrial committees and the appointment of a delegation to the International Labour Conference. Delegations to the Conference were paid for by the Governments and were delegations from the countries concerned. In the case of the industrial committees, however, the expenses of the employers' and workers' representatives were not borne by the Governments, and the British Government therefore thought that the nominations should be entirely in the hands of the organisations concerned.

There were two possible methods in Great Britain. One would be for the Trades Union Congress to assist the Government in convening a conference at which the unions concerned would themselves nominate their representatives. The other would be for the Trades Union Congress to convene the conference and to secure nominations from the organisations concerned. What was important was that the nominations should be made freely by the organisations concerned and not merely by the central organisation.

The Governing Body should not try to settle the matter solely in the light of the conditions in Great Britain, because in some countries there was more than one central organisation, and this made it difficult to settle as a uniform principle that the nominations from the different industries should come through one organisation. He thought that Governments must be free to adopt any method of procedure which they thought suitable, provided that all the organisations which had a substantial membership employed in the industries concerned took part in the selection of the members of the industrial committees.

The British Government hoped that once the employers on the one hand and the workers on the other had been brought together to make their nominations they would remain in some sort of a committee to keep in touch with the work of the international industrial committee. The workers would not necessarily meet with the employers, but joint meetings could be arranged if desired. If a standing joint body were contemplated on the national plane he thought that further difficulties would arise.
The British Government was anxious that in any case nominations should be made freely by the organisations in the industry concerned.

Mr. Erulkar suggested that the same procedure should be adopted as for the appointment of the non-governmental delegates to the Conference. In that connection he wished to bring forward a point which affected certain countries only. He thought that it should be made quite clear that it was intended that the national organisation of workers and employers should be consulted. It would be recalled that questions had been raised before the Credentials Committee with regard to the choice of the employers' and workers' representatives from certain countries. That difficulty had been overcome in respect of the Indian delegation to the Conference, but it would be just as well to make it quite clear that the national organisations of employers and workers were to make the nominations.

Mr. Hauck thought that there was fairly general agreement that the employers' and workers' members of the industrial committees should be appointed by the Governments on the lines suggested in the Office note. It was obvious that in the International Labour Organisation Governments could make such appointments only in agreement with the most representative organisations of employers and workers in the industry concerned.

The Acting Director said that the point to which Sir Frederick Leggett had called attention was extremely important. The Employers' and Workers' delegates to the Conference were the official delegates of their country, with credentials which their Governments issued to them in the same way as to the Government delegates. The employers' and workers' members of the industrial committees, on the other hand, would be acting as the representatives of employers' and workers' organisations and would not be delegates of their countries.

The reason why the Office note had suggested that the Governments should play some part in the selection of the employers' and workers' members of the industrial committees was that neither the Office nor the Governing Body were in a position to take a decision on what was essentially a domestic question, namely, the question of which organisations should be asked to send representatives. It would be impossible to overcome that practical difficulty without having recourse to the good offices of the Governments to determine which organisations should be consulted, and the quickest way to do that was to ask Governments to carry out the consultations. As Sir Frederick Leggett had pointed out, however, the Government's role would be that of an intermediary, and in some cases little more than the role of a post office.

The Chairman put to the vote the proposal made in the Office note concerning the method of selecting the employers' and workers' representatives on the industrial committees, as explained by the Acting Director.

The Governing Body unanimously approved this proposal.

Bipartite or Tripartite Character of Committees.

The Chairman said that he proposed to ask the Governing Body to vote on the question whether the industrial committees should be bipartite or tripartite in character.

The following text had been proposed:

The industrial committees should be tripartite in character. This does not negate the right of each committee to appoint bipartite subcommittees or to arrange for parts of its meetings to be bipartite in character.

He asked the groups to decide on their attitude at the meetings which they were about to hold.

The sitting closed at 12.10 p.m.

Carter Goodrich.
MINUTES OF THE NINTH SITTING
(Tuesday, 30 January 1945 — 2.55 p.m.)

The Governing Body was composed as follows: Mr. Goodrich (Chairman), Mr. Antoine, Mr. Benough, Mr. Bianchi, Mr. Chapa, Mr. Chu Hsueh-fan, Mrs. Clegg Riedel, Mr. Dahl, Mr. England, Mr. Erulkar, Sir John Forbes Watson, Mr. Fuss, Mr. Gemmill, Mr. Gouthier, Mr. Hallsworth, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Hjelmtveit, Mr. Kosina, Mr. Kovacevich, Mr. Laurent, Mr. Lecocq, Sir Frederick Leggett, Mr. Li Ping-heng, Mr. Lombardo Toledano, Mr. Martin, Mr. McDavitt, Mr. Mostras, Mr. Oldenbroek, Mr. del Rio y Cañedo, Mr. Stanczyk, Mr. Watt.

Absent: Mr. Alvarado.

Third Item on the Agenda

Proposals concerning Industrial Committees (continued)

Bipartite or Tripartite Composition of Committees (continued).

Sir John Forbes Watson said that after thorough consideration of the question whether the industrial committees should be bipartite or tripartite in character the Employers' group had asked him to read the following statement:

The Employers' group is unanimously opposed to the proposed industrial committees being tripartite and so including representatives of Governments as well as representatives of employers and workers.

The French employer does not think it necessary for the Employers' group to make a formal declaration.

All the other members of the Employers' group, however, consider that on a matter of such importance it is essential that their views should be placed on record.

The following declaration is therefore put forward by the Employers' group with the exception of the French employer, and the reference to the Employers' group in the declaration is therefore to be read as meaning the whole of the Employers' group with the exception of the French employer.

The Employers' group wholeheartedly supports the proposal of the British Government that international industrial committees representing employers and workers should be set up in industries to be selected. It believes that this would improve the realistic nature of the work of the International Labour Organisation.

The group is, however, entirely opposed to the addition of Government representatives to these committees. If these committees were, in effect, tripartite there would be a strong temptation for the Employers' and Workers' groups to become advocates and not negotiators and for the Government representatives to act, willingly or unwillingly, as arbitrators. This means political and not industrial decisions.

The group recognises that in some countries the organisation of employers and workers is not fully developed, but the issue to be faced is whether the International Labour Organisation desires such development to be encouraged or retarded. If, as the group believes, such development should be encouraged, experience has shown that the committees should be composed so as to throw upon the employers' and workers' representatives the responsibility of really trying to reach agreement.

This two-group principle is not in contradiction to the three-group basis of the Organisation. The precedent of employers and workers working together in the preliminary stages without Governments has for a quarter of a century
been established for the shipping industry in the Joint Maritime Commission of the International Labour Organisation and the Governing Body has just had an outstanding example of how successful that machinery is. Moreover, the reports of the proposed industrial committees would necessarily thereafter come before the Governing Body for examination and action. Both there and in the technical and ordinary Conference the Governments would be able to play their full and effective part. In addition, the Employers' group fully recognises that there are subjects, such as social security, on which Government collaboration is essential at the outset. It therefore recommends that the proposed committees should be empowered to recommend to the Governing Body that Government representatives be added to sections of the committees considering specified subjects such as social security.

The Employers' group appeals to the Government representatives and the Workers' group, in the interests of freedom of association and the development of responsible workers' and employers' organisations, to accept the principle that these industrial committees should be representative solely of the employers and workers.

*The Chairman* put to the vote the proposal read to the Governing Body at the close of the 8th sitting.

*By 21 votes to 8 the Governing Body decided that the industrial committees should be tripartite in character, but that this did not negate the right of each committee to appoint bipartite subcommittees or to arrange for parts of its meetings to be bipartite in character.*

**Selection of Industries for which Industrial Committees Should be Established.**

*The Acting Director* said that the Office document suggested that industrial committees should be set up in the first place for inland transport, coal mining, the metal trades (including iron and steel production) and textiles. It would be necessary for the Governing Body to take a separate decision in each case, and also to decide whether the Inland Transport and Coal-Mining Committees should be of a regional character, as proposed by the Office.

*Mr. Hallsworth* said that after considering the question fully the Workers' group had come to the conclusion that the first industries for which industrial committees should be set up were European inland transport and European coal mining, on account of the urgency of the situation in Europe. At a later date, however, the scope of the Coal-Mining Committee should be extended to cover mining in general, including ore mining, which was of special importance in the Latin American countries. Similarly, the European Inland Transport Committee should ultimately be widened to cover all forms of transport except maritime transport. In both cases the extension of scope could be secured by setting up subcommittees.

The Workers' group also agreed with the United States proposal that in the case of the metal industries generally there should be not a single committee, but one committee for iron and steel production and a separate committee for the engineering trades, with subdivisions for shipbuilding and for aircraft and automobile manufacture and allied trades.

The Workers' group further agreed with the proposals concerning textiles, although there was room for difference of opinion as to how the subdivisions should be made. One school of thought believed that there should be a Textile Committee with subdivisions for cotton, for rayon and for wool, while another thought that a start might be made, as the Office document suggested, with a single subcommittee for both cotton and rayon and another for wool.
The Workers' group had also considered the possibility of setting up a committee for the petroleum industry, an industry which was of general importance in economic development and of particular interest to the whole of the American continent. With this addition to the committees suggested, the initial scope of the industrial committees would be wide enough and would give satisfaction to the hopes of the workers in the various industries.

With regard to the membership of the Iron and Steel Production Committee, the Workers' group wished to suggest that Mexico should be represented.

Mr. Lombardo Toledano wished to stress that it had been agreed in the Workers' group that some of the industrial committees might make a very useful contribution to the economic reconstruction of the devastated areas. He thought that it would be wise to underline that function in the name of the committees, and to call them "Industrial Committees to Aid the Economic Reconstruction of the Devastated Areas of Europe".

There were, however, other industrial committees which would not be set up for the purpose of promoting European reconstruction, and these committees should be classified logically, since otherwise industries might be selected at random without a general plan. He thought that industries fell into two groups, the extractive industries and the manufacturing industries. But if this method of classification seemed to be somewhat abstract, an alternative method might be considered. At the present time the economic organisation of industry was based on the heavy industries, namely, petroleum, coal, electric power, the mining and metallurgical industries, and the electrical industries. Another important category was that of the transport industries; and, finally, there was the third category of the manufacturing industries.

He thought that the list suggested by the British Government was somewhat arbitrary, but it was supplemented by that put forward by the Office. He asked the Governing Body to bear in mind the need to provide a logical basis for the establishment of the industrial committees.

He wished also to suggest that it was of urgent importance to include a Petroleum Committee in the proposed list on account of the growing importance of oil in the world economy, and especially in the economy of Latin America. Of the whole of world production, Latin American production represented 31.11 per cent., comprising 16.25 per cent. crude petroleum and 14.86 per cent. derivatives.

The oil potential of Latin America was very great, especially in countries which had not yet entered the world market, such as Brazil, Bolivia, and Paraguay. The whole economy of several Latin American countries depended largely on their oil production; this was the case in Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia and Mexico. The oil industry had only just begun to develop on an international scale. For the sake of the development of international trade and of the settlement of the social aspects of the problems of the oil industry, particularly in Latin America, he believed that it was urgently necessary to set up an industrial committee for petroleum, and wished to move the following resolution:

Whereas the petroleum industry plays a very important part in world economy;
Whereas in any technical classification of industries, the petroleum industry must take a high rank;
Whereas there are many countries of the continent of America in which petroleum production is an important factor in the national economy;
Whereas a Committee for the Petroleum Industry would cater for a considerable number of countries and substantial numbers of workers,
The Governing Body decides to set up an Industrial Committee for the Petroleum Industry.

Sir Frederick Leggett said that the list proposed by the British Government consisted of basic industries which were carried on in many countries and in which the organisations on both sides had some experience of international discussion. In each of these industries there was an old-established international federation on the workers' side, and it had seemed advisable to choose in the first place industries
which were important in themselves and in which members with useful past experience could be found to sit upon the committees.

Account also had to be taken of the resources of the Office. At the present time the Office could not undertake to set on foot a large number of committees. The British Government would have liked to see the building industry included in the list, in view of its great importance during the reconstruction period, but it thought that in the first instance the committees should be confined to the industries mentioned in the Office list in the order given.

With regard to the transport industry he wished to point out that there had already been established a European Inland Transport Organisation which was composed of the Governments concerned, and some direct contact with that body should be established by the trade union organisations in those countries. He thought that the International Transport Workers' Federation already had a European Committee. In view of the fact that governmental organisation already existed and could have contacts with the employers' and workers' organisations he thought that it was unnecessary to set up an industrial committee in the same field.

In the case of coal mining also the trade unions of the European countries should be the bodies to bring forward the workers' point of view. The British Government was against the proposal to start these industrial committees on a European basis and thought that they should be international from the beginning. There would be no objection to the setting up by the international committees of regional subcommittees, but it was important that no countries which were interested in their work should be excluded. Even in the case of the reconstruction of Europe it was impossible to think that it could be carried out with European resources only.

With regard to textiles, the determination of the subdivisions would no doubt be facilitated by a general consultation of all the workers' organisations.

With regard to the oil industry, he proposed that the Office should prepare a general report on the organisational basis of the industry in the various countries, a subject on which little definite information was available at present.

In conclusion, he proposed that industrial committees international in character should be set up immediately for the industries on the list put forward by the Office.

Mr. Fuss would like a clearer definition of the respective competence of the proposed committee for the metal trades and its subcommittee for automobile and aircraft manufacture. If the proposal was for the setting up of a subcommittee proper, its conclusions would have to be referred back to the full committee for the metal trades.

He wished to point out that a worker in the automobile industry could easily move into an occupation in the metal trades generally, and he did not think that different working conditions could be laid down for the two categories. He noted however that the membership proposed for the Metal Trades Industrial Committee and for the subcommittee on aircraft and automobile manufacture was different. He thought it would be preferable to have two separate subcommittees, one for the metal trades, including aircraft and automobile manufacture, and the other for shipbuilding, which was quite separate from the rest of the metal trades. Although Belgium did not possess a highly developed aircraft and automobile manufacturing industry, it had big automobile assembly plants and hoped to establish aircraft assembly plants also, and the interests of the large number of workers employed in these plants ought to be represented on any subcommittee which was set up.

Mr. Dahl wished to draw attention to the importance to Norway of the wool textile industry, which could give employment after the war to a large number of workers who were at present unemployed, since there would be a shortage of clothing for some considerable time. He suggested that Norway should be added to the list of countries to be represented on the wool section of the Textile Committee.

Mr. Antoine, referring to the Inland Transport Committee, thought that while
the Committee should ultimately be a general one it should begin by dealing with inland transport in Europe.

With regard to all the other industrial committees, including the Coal-Mining Committee, he thought that it would be wiser for them to be international in character from the outset. There would shortly be considerable exchanges of coal from one country to another which would have important social effects both in Europe and elsewhere. With regard to the metal trades, having regard to the fact that workers could easily move from one branch of the industry to another, he thought that it would be advisable to set up a single committee which could split up into subcommittees if necessary. The same procedure might be applied in the textile industry.

A special industrial committee would also be useful for the building industry, on account of the importance which that industry would have in Europe in the near future.

With regard to the oil industry, he was prepared to agree to the setting up of an industrial committee, although the number of workers affected was smaller than in the case of the other industries he had mentioned, and he asked that the French employers might be represented on that committee.

Sir John Forbes Watson said that although the Governing Body had taken what he regarded as a dangerous decision in regard to the composition of the industrial committees he wished to make his contribution to the discussion.

He was concerned at the large number of committees proposed. The Governing Body had already decided that a number of very important meetings should be held in the near future, and now it was planning to set up a whole series of international committees. He wished to stress the very complex structure of the industries concerned. In Great Britain there were some 30 trade unions which negotiated collective agreements in engineering. In textiles separate committees would be needed for cotton, wool and rayon. In his opinion, a start should be made with an Inland Transport Committee. The Office had pointed out that it could do little more than make to bring together the parties concerned. Contrary to what Mr. Lombardo Toledano seemed to think, the industrial committees would not deal with economic questions except in so far as they were within the scope of the International Labour Organisation.

He observed further that the countries which it was proposed should be represented on the industrial committees included Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Netherlands and Yugoslavia, countries which were still wholly or partly under enemy occupation.

He therefore urged that an Inland Transport Committee should be set up immediately and that the position in respect of the other industries should be reconsidered by the Governing Body at its next session.

Mr. Oldenbroek did not consider that the Governing Body should confine itself to setting up only one committee. He fully agreed with Mr. Hallsworth's proposals, and he wanted all the committees to be international, but he expected that the questions of international transport in Europe and of coal mining in Europe were those which would have to be dealt with immediately.

It was not proposed that all the committees should meet at the same time, but if the Governing Body took a decision in respect of given industries the Office would know the subjects on which it must set to work.

He also thought that there was an urgent need to set up a committee for the petroleum industry.

Mr. McDavitt asked whether the staff of the Office could cope with the work entailed by the setting up of the industrial committees.

The Acting Director said that there appeared to be general agreement with the selection of industries proposed by the Office, subject to there being two separate committees for the metal trades.

The difficulty was to establish any order of priority as between the different industries, several of which had been pressing for an international committee for some time, and the Office had therefore avoided suggesting any priority.
It was not very easy to give a definite answer to Mr. McDavitt's question, because although it might be decided to set up four or five committees there was no means of saying how long it would take the countries concerned to carry out the consultations preliminary to the appointment of their members. This must be done before any meeting of the committees could be held, and might take some time. As full information with regard to the composition of a committee was received it would be possible to consider convening that committee at a time convenient to its members. In any case the meetings of the various committees would not take place simultaneously.

The Office would lay before each committee a preliminary documentation which was already being assembled. Later special attention would be paid to any points which the committee indicated as of particular importance for its discussions. The first meeting of each committee might have before it an agenda similar to that which had been prepared for the Textile Conference and would be provided with a preliminary outline of the principal social problems of the industry and their economic repercussions. This preliminary work might not be as fully done as it would have been done in peacetime, but the committee would nevertheless have a sound documentary basis for its first meeting and could give an indication of the points which should be studied more fully in preparing for its future meetings.

Mr. Watt agreed with the rest of the Workers' group that all the committees should be international in character with the exception of the Inland Transport Committee. With regard to this latter committee, he would like to know what its specific functions were to be. It had been suggested that the committee would deal primarily with the reconstruction of the European transport system; if that were so, the committee should be a European committee. If, on the other hand, it was to be a permanent committee to deal with transport problems on all the main waterways of the world, it should have a different character.

With regard to the metal industry, he thought that the term "metal trades" would give a much clearer notion of the demarcation of those industries as it was understood in the United States than would the term "engineering".

The Chairman said that before taking a decision on the actual setting up of the committees the Governing Body must decide whether the Inland Transport Committee should initially be purely European in character or should be inter-regional.

In respect to a question put by Mr. Watt, the Acting Director said that according to the decision which was taken on this point the Office would provide the committee with documentation concerning European inland transport or inland transport in all countries, in so far as information was available.

The Chairman explained that the term "inland transport" covered not only transport by water, but transport by rail, road and air also.

Mr. Lombardo Toledano thought that if the Inland Transport Committee was to deal solely with the rehabilitation of the transport systems of the devastated areas of Europe its title should indicate that fact. If its scope were not to be so restricted, it ought to be definitely international in character.

Mr. Chapa thought that if the Inland Transport Committee was to deal with transport by rail, road, inland waterways and air, it should be international in character, because many of the same problems arose in America as in Europe.

Mr. Laurent said that even if the committee were to be made international in character the Governing Body might decide that it should deal in the first place with those European questions which were of the greatest urgency.

By 17 votes to 3 the Governing Body decided that the scope of the Inland Transport Committee should not be limited to Europe but should be inter-regional.
The Chairman said that the same question arose in respect of the coal-mining industry.

Mr. Gemmill pointed out that South Africa and Australia were both important coal producing countries. This should be remembered when organising the committee's work.

Sir John Forbes Watson said that the coal-mining industry was essentially international in character.

By 25 votes to none the Governing Body decided that the scope of the Coal-Mining Committee should not be limited to Europe but should be inter-regional.

The Chairman said that having taken the preceding two votes, which defined the character of the two proposed committees should it be decided to set them up, the Governing Body would now have to take a decision as to the industries for which industrial committees should be established.

This decision might be taken on the basis of the proposals made by the Office.

Sir John Forbes Watson wished to propose, by way of amendment, that the Governing Body should confine itself at the present time to setting up an Inland Transport Committee and should adjourn its consideration of the committees for the other industries until its 95th Session.

By 22 votes to 6 the Governing Body rejected the amendment moved by Sir John Forbes Watson.

The Chairman called for a vote on Mr. Lombardo Toledano's motion to add the petroleum industry to the list of industries for which industrial committees should be set up. This motion was in fact an amendment to the Office proposals.

Sir Frederick Leggett wished to make it clear that if he voted against this amendment this should not be interpreted as meaning that he was opposed to the setting up of a committee for the petroleum industry at a later date.

By 15 votes to 6 the Governing Body adopted the motion moved by Mr. Lombardo Toledano to add the petroleum industry to the list of industries for which industrial committees should be established.

Mr. Stanczyk said that he had already had occasion to stress the importance of the building industry, which would be a key industry in respect to employment in the liberated countries of Europe. Building would also form an essential part of the reconstruction programme in countries such as Great Britain. Furthermore, building had an important social aspect, for so long as the shortage of housing accommodation lasted measures to raise the standard of living would remain illusory.

He wished to move a formal proposal that the Governing Body should decide to set up a committee for the building industry, and that that committee should be convened at the earliest possible date to begin its work.

Mr. Hauck seconded Mr. Stanczyk's motion.

Mr. Antoine proposed that the scope of the committee for the building industry should be widened to include civil engineering and public works, since labour was interchangeable between these various branches.

By 17 votes to 3 the Governing Body decided to add the building, civil engineering and public works industries to the list of industries for which industrial committees should be established.
By 22 votes to 3 the Governing Body decided to set up industrial committees for the following industries:

- Inland transport,
- Coal mining,
- Iron and steel production,
- Metal trades,
- Textiles,
- Petroleum production and refining,
- Building, civil engineering and public works.

Membership of Committees.

The Acting Director said that the Office had made suggestions concerning the countries which should be represented on the committees for the first five industries, but not for the petroleum industry nor for building, civil engineering and public works.

It would be for the Governing Body to decide whether it wished to add any other countries to the lists suggested for the first five industries.

Mr. Hallsworth moved that Mexico should be added to the list for the Iron and Steel Committee.

The Chairman called attention to the fact that with regard to inland transport and coal-mining only European countries were included in the original suggestions of the Office.

He suggested that the Governing Body should deal with the other committees first, and should begin by taking a decision in respect of the Iron and Steel Production Committee.

The Governing Body decided to add Mexico to the list of countries suggested for membership of the Iron and Steel Committee in the Office document. The revised list is as follows:

**Iron and Steel Production**: United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, United Kingdom, India, Luxembourg, Mexico, Sweden, Union of South Africa.

Sir John Forbes Watson pointed out that the Office documents described as "engineering" what were really the metal trades. In the subdivisions relating to shipbuilding on the one hand and aircraft and automobile manufacture and allied trades on the other he noted countries which did not figure in the general list. If there were to be a general committee which could be divided into subcommittees all the countries concerned ought to figure in the original list.

The Acting Director said that the term "metal trades" could be substituted for "engineering trades", and that a general list should be drawn up to include all the countries interested in any of the various sections. The same applied to textiles, for which a general committee should be set up which could be split up later into subcommittees.

The Governing Body decided to substitute the term "metal trades" for the term "engineering trades", and to include in the list of countries under this heading all the countries listed in the various sections of the list drawn up by the Office for the engineering and allied trades. The revised list is as follows:

**Metal Trades**: United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, United Kingdom, India, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland.

The Governing Body decided to include in the list of countries under the heading of
“textiles” all the countries given in the two subsections of the list drawn up by the Office, with the addition of Norway. The revised list is as follows:

Textiles: United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, United Kingdom, India, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland.

Sir John Forbes Watson pointed out that cotton, rayon and wool were three distinct industries. It was proposed that the general committee should divide itself into subcommittees, but he thought that the textile industry would hold the view that the three sections were independent industries.

Sir Frederick Leggett said that if all the organisations concerned were called together on the committee they would have the opportunity of expressing their views on how the industry should be divided.

The Governing Body approved this proposal.

The Acting Director pointed out that as the Coal-Mining Committee was to be international in character the following countries ought to be added to the proposed list: United States of America, Australia, Canada, India, Union of South Africa.

The Governing Body decided to add to the original list drawn up by the Office for membership of the Coal-Mining Committee the countries mentioned by the Acting Director. The revised list is as follows:

Coal-Mining: United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, United Kingdom, India, Netherlands, Poland, Union of South Africa.

Mr. Hauck noted that the Governing Body had decided that the Inland Transport Committee and the Coal-Mining Committee should be inter-regional instead of purely European, as originally suggested. He had abstained from voting in both cases because although he believed that the International Labour Organisation should deal with the problems of the various continents, he was afraid that by enlarging the committees the initiation of their work would be delayed. It was of the highest importance for European reconstruction that the two committees, and especially the Inland Transport Committee, should begin to operate at once.

He asked the Acting Director whether it would not be possible to decide that these two international committees should be split up into regional subcommittees, and whether the Governing Body could not immediately set up European subcommittees for transport and coal mining composed of the countries given in the original list suggested by the Office.

Sir John Forbes Watson did not think that it was possible to go back on the decisions which had already been taken.

The Chairman pointed out that the Governing Body had already decided that these two committees should be inter-regional.

Sir Frederick Leggett did not want the decision which the Governing Body had taken to be interpreted as holding up the rehabilitation of European transport.

Mr. Hauck accepted the Governing Body’s decision. He had simply been seeking some means of enabling the Inland Transport Committee, which had a task of the utmost urgency to perform in Europe, to begin its practical work along the lines laid down by the Governing Body at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Gouthier supported Mr. Hauck’s suggestion, which he did not regard as incompatible with the decision already taken by the Governing Body. The Committee was to be inter-regional, but that did not prevent it from starting on its urgent tasks in Europe as soon as possible.
Mr. Fuss said that he had refrained from voting on the Inland Transport Committee for the same reasons as Mr. Hauck. He thought that the international committee could be split up from the outset into two sections which could come together later. The preparatory work for Europe and for the other continents could be done at the same time. This method would enable steps to be taken without delay to deal with the very grave transport situation in the recently liberated countries of Europe.

With regard to the Coal-Mining Committee, he thought that the problems of the coal industry formed a single whole and that the committee should be world-wide in scope.

The Acting Director thought that it was necessary to clear up a misunderstanding. While the International Labour Office was anxious to do everything it could to help the liberated countries of Europe to solve their urgent problems, it would be an illusion to suppose that the industrial committees could do much in that field. He was sorry that this was so, but the committees were being set up for a different purpose. They were an attempt to build up machinery of industrial relations in the great occupations throughout the world.

The industrial committees would certainly discuss some of the problems which Mr. Hauck had in mind, and their discussions would no doubt make an indirect contribution towards the solution of those problems, which were of vital importance to Europe. But it would be wrong to give the impression in Europe that by setting up its committee the International Labour Organisation was taking the responsibility for putting European transport on its feet. That would be the responsibility of an official European Transport Organisation which was already planned.

In any case, no immediate results could be expected. When the Office staff had returned to Montreal it would have to get in touch with Governments with regard to the appointment of the members of the committees. Consideration would also have to be given to the possibility of appointing more than one representative for some countries and some branches of industry.

The Office would again report to the Governing Body at its next session with regard to any points which remained to be decided. In the meantime it might have been able to secure a list of persons who would act as representatives of the European countries on some of the committees. If so, it might be possible to adopt some procedure such as Mr. Hauck and Mr. Fuss had suggested, but until the machinery had been organised and had begun to operate the industrial committees should not be expected to make any immediate contribution to the solution of the burning problems of Europe.

Mr. Oldenbroek said that he had voted in favour of making the committees international because it would be wrong to give the impression that a world organisation like the International Labour Organisation was primarily interested in European problems. Nevertheless he thought that the committees ought to begin their work without delay. With regard to transport, it had been mentioned that there was an organisation which was ready to do the work; but there were very urgent labour problems to deal with, and it was important that they should be dealt with by the International Labour Organisation.

The Chairman said that there was nothing to prevent the Governing Body from making the urgent problems of European transport the first item on the agenda of the Inland Transport Committee.

Mrs. Clegg Riedel moved that the urgent problems of transport in Europe should be the first question referred to the international Inland Transport Committee.

Sir Frederick Leggett seconded the proposal.

The Governing Body adopted the motion of Mrs. Clegg Riedel to make the urgent problems of transport in Europe the first item on the agenda of the Inland Transport Committee.

The sitting closed at 6.18 p.m.

Carter Goodrich.
MINUTES OF THE TENTH SITTING (PRIVATE)

At this sitting, which was held in private, the Governing Body considered the twelfth item on the agenda (Report of the Finance Committee), the fifteenth item on the agenda (Report of the Acting Director) and the second item on the agenda (Second Report of the Committee on Constitutional Questions).

In accordance with Article 10 of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the minutes of this sitting have been printed separately.
MINUTES OF THE ELEVENTH SITTING

(Wednesday, 31 January 1945 — 2.50 p.m.)

The Governing Body was composed as follows: Mr. Goodrich (Chairman), Mr. Agnides, Mr. Antoine, Mr. Bengough, Mr. Bianchi, Mr. Chapa, Mr. Chu Hsueh-fan, Mrs. Cleeg Riedel, Mr. Erulkar, Sir John Forbes Watson, Mr. Fuss, Mr. Gemmill, Mr. Gouthier, Mr. Hallsworth, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Hjelmevæit, Mr. Kosina, Mr. Kovacevich, Mr. Laurent, Mr. Lecocq, Sir Frederick Leggett, Mr. Li Ping-heng, Mr. Lombardo Toledano, Mr. Martin, Mr. Mc-Davitt, Sir David Mee, Mr. Oldenbroek, Mr. del Río y Cañedo, Mr. Stanczyk, Mr. Warning, Mr. Watt.

Absent: Mr. Alvarado.

Third Item on the Agenda

Composition of Industrial Committees (continued)

Composition of Industrial Committees.

The Acting Director said that as it had now been decided that the Inland Transport Committee should be inter-regional and not European in composition, the following countries should be added to the original list: United States of America, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, India, Mexico, Union of South Africa.

The Governing Body approved these additions, and adopted the revised list, which is as follows:

Inland Transport: United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, United Kingdom, Greece, India, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Yugoslavia.

The Acting Director read the provisional list suggested by the Office for the membership of the Industrial Committee for Building, Civil Engineering and Public Works. He said that this list might be completed at the next session.

The Governing Body approved the provisional list submitted by the Office, which is as follows:

Building, Civil Engineering and Public Works: United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, United Kingdom, India, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of South Africa.

The Acting Director said that with regard to the petroleum production and refining industry the Office had drawn up, on the basis of fairly recent statistics, a provisional list consisting of the countries which produced over one hundred million tons per annum. This list, which might be subject to revision at the next session, consisted of the following countries: United States of America, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, United Kingdom, Iraq, Iran, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru and Venezuela.

Mr. Antoine asked that France should be added to the list, in view of the extensive French interests in oil production in various countries and the large refineries which existed in France.

Sir David Mee asked that Burma, which was an important oil producing country, should also be added.
The Acting Director said that Burma was covered by the United Kingdom, and the reason for which the United Kingdom figured in the list was because of the oil-production of Trinidad and Burma.

The Governing Body approved the list proposed by the Office, with the addition of France. The revised list is as follows:

*Petroleum Production and Refining:* United States of America, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, France, United Kingdom, Iran, Iraq, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Venezuela.

The Governing Body decided that the membership of each industrial committee should include a delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office comprising an equal number of representatives of the Government group, the Employers' group and the Workers' group. The number of representatives from each group might vary with circumstances.

Mr. Hallsworth wished to know whether the national committees which it was proposed should be established would be bipartite or tripartite. He pointed out that in Great Britain organised industrial relations in various industries had existed for a long time, and that there were in fact national committees in the various industries; but the situation would doubtless be different in other countries.

The Chairman said that a decision with regard to the establishment of national committees was not essential for the starting of the international industrial committees, and might therefore be adjourned until the next session.

The Governing Body adjourned until its 95th Session consideration of the suggestion made in the Office note that national committees should be set up to work in close co-operation with the international industrial committees.

The Governing Body adjourned until its 95th Session the suggestion made in the Office note that representatives of international employers' organisations and of international trade secretariats should be included in the membership of the committees.

**Time, Place and Agenda of the First Meeting of Each Committee.**

The Governing Body authorised the Acting Director to convene a meeting of each committee at an appropriate date in 1945 after consultation with the Officers of the Governing Body and such other consultations as might be necessary.

The Chairman said that with regard to the agenda of the committees, the Office had suggested that it include two general questions. In the case of the Inland Transport Committee the Governing Body had already decided to make the question of European transport the first item on the agenda.

Mr. Hallsworth asked whether it was understood that the agenda proposed by the Office for the several committees included the employment problem in each for the industries concerned.

Sir John Forbes Watson said that the proposed agenda already included practically all the activity with which the Organisation could deal in respect of each industry. So far as economic questions were concerned, the industrial committees could not go further than the Organisation as a whole.

The Chairman pointed out to Mr. Hallsworth that the Office proposals referred to "the prospective employment situation in the industry" concerned.

Mr. Hallsworth accepted this explanation.
The Governing Body approved the proposals made by the Office concerning the agenda of the committees.

Nature of the Decisions of the Committees.

The Governing Body approved the suggestions made in the Office note on this point.

Representation of the Committees on the Governing Body.

The Governing Body adjourned until its 95th Session consideration of the suggestions contained in the Office note on this point.

Financial Arrangements for 1945 Meetings.

The Chairman reminded the Governing Body that, on the recommendation of its Finance Committee, it had already taken certain decisions on this subject.

Sir John Forbes Watson pointed out that the proposal in the Office note was that the Governments should pay the expenses of the Government members of the Committees and that the Organisation should pay for the employers' and workers' members, two members from each country being allowed for each group. This number was quite inadequate in the case of some of the committees. It was impossible to have the textile industry represented by two employers when it had at least three main subdivisions. It had to be considered whether the Governments should not bear the whole cost of the industrial committees. Special arrangements must be made to meet such cases. On the other hand, the employers and workers could not be expected to bear the cost of sending extra representatives, especially as they might have to attend meetings in different countries.

The textile industry was not the only industry for which two representatives were inadequate. The position was similar in the case of the metal trades, which had various subdivisions. In the engineering industry alone there were in Great Britain 30 trade unions which negotiated agreements. It would be wrong to give some of the parties concerned the impression that they were being held aloof from the industrial committees.

There were various possible solutions. Governments might agree to bear the expenses of any additional non-Government representatives whose participation in the work of the committees was desirable; or again, the voting power might be confined to certain members. In any case, the committees would make a wrong start if the employers' and workers' organisations were required to bear the expenses of any additional representatives whose presence might seem essential. Some more elastic arrangements than those suggested by the Office must be made with regard to the composition of some of the committees.

Mr. Hallsworth also thought that the decisions taken in the Finance Committee and in the Governing Body had not settled all the financial aspects of the problem. He agreed with Sir John Forbes Watson that serious difficulties would arise in connection with the composition of some of the committees. He thought that consideration should be given at once to the possibility of changing the maximum number of representatives of each side on certain committees.

Sir Frederick Leggett did not think that much progress could be made with that aspect of the problem at present. After the decisions which had been taken the Governments would have to get into touch with the representatives of the industries concerned. When this had been done, a better idea could be obtained of their views with regard to their representation on the industrial committees, and the Governing Body would no doubt be able to take a decision on the matter at its next session.

He emphasised the danger of any system which provided for a large number of representatives from each country on any given committee just because it was necessary to go beyond the maximum number suggested by the Office in certain specific cases.
Sir John Forbes Watson agreed that the matter should be referred to the next session, provided that Governments were asked to indicate the minimum number to which they would agree. On the basis of that information the Governing Body would be able to take a decision at its next session.

The Governing Body decided to postpone until its 95th Session consideration of the suggestions made by the Office with regard to the maximum number of members from each country and each group who should sit on the committees.

It was agreed that immediately after the 94th Session the Governments should consult the organisations concerned with a view to ascertaining their wishes with regard to the number of their representatives on the industrial committees, and that on the basis of these consultations proposals would be laid before the Governing Body at its 95th Session.
APPENDIX III

THIRD ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Proposals concerning Industrial Committees

The idea of establishing committees for some of the major industries was before the New York Conference of 1941. The question took on a new importance when specific proposals on the subject were submitted to the Governing Body on behalf of the British Government in December 1943. Since then the questions of general policy involved have been widely canvassed and the Philadelphia Conference has adopted a resolution expressing the opinion that the Organisation should take action forthwith and inviting the Governing Body to elaborate regulations governing the activities of industrial committees. It would therefore seem reasonable to hope that the Governing Body may be able to take definite decisions on the subject in the course of its present session and the following proposals have accordingly been framed with this end in view.

The Office has not been able in the brief period which has elapsed since the Philadelphia Conference to prepare technical surveys of the structure and problems of the various industries for which industrial committees have been proposed. It has, however, been able to formulate general proposals in the light of the discussions which have already taken place and the present document is accordingly being circulated in time to enable members of the Governing Body to seek the best available technical advice before the Governing Body meets. A supplementary paper will be circulated at a later date if circumstances should so require.

The desirability in principle of establishing the proposed industrial committees may be regarded as having been settled by the unanimous adoption by the Philadelphia Conference of a report on the subject. The questions requiring consideration by the Governing Body at the present stage relate to the manner in which this decision of principle is to be implemented and may conveniently be grouped under the following headings:

(a) The selection of the industries for which committees should be established in the first instance;
(b) The determination of the composition of the committees and the method of selection of their members, including the arrangements to be made for industries which are particularly complex in structure and industries which are closely related to each other;
(c) The arrangements to be made for meetings of the committees to be established in the first instance, including particularly the date, place and agenda of the first meeting of each such committee and the financial arrangements for such meetings.

Selection of Industries for Which Committees Should Be Established in the First Instance

The industries for which the establishment of industrial committees has been suggested are grouped below in two columns, the first of which lists the industries suggested for immediate action in the British Government proposal of December 1943, while the second lists certain further industries mentioned in Report 1 submitted by the Office to the Philadelphia Conference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British Government list</th>
<th>Office additional list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal mining</td>
<td>Chemicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron and steel</td>
<td>Electrical industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and allied industries</td>
<td>Air transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and civil engineering</td>
<td>Petroleum production and refining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile industries (with any necessary sub-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committees for cotton and rayon, wool, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway, road and inland transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive trades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Office additional list is not in any sense an alternative to the British Government list but is intended merely as an indication of further industries to which the system of industrial com-
mittees might be progressively extended in the manner contemplated by the original British proposal. While it is desirable to build up the system of industrial committees as rapidly as circumstances allow, it is clearly necessary to make a start by selecting for immediate action a small number of well organised industries which present international problems of urgent importance. The following suggestions, which are not arranged in any particular order of priority, have been prepared with this consideration in view.

It will be for the Governing Body to determine whether an immediate decision should be taken in respect of all the suggested industries or whether the system should be introduced more gradually, and whether any particular order of priority should be followed, so far as circumstances allow, in making the arrangements for meetings of the committees.

**Inland Transport.**

The reorganisation of inland transport in Europe will shortly present a problem of great urgency the labour aspects of which will be of capital importance. Arrangements are being made by Governments for the establishment of an international organisation for the handling of this problem which is expected to seek the assistance of the International Labour Organisation in connection with labour matters. In order to enable the Organisation to give authoritative advice in respect of such matters it would seem desirable to constitute without delay an industrial committee for inland transport questions. Inland transport questions take different forms in different parts of the world, and while it may well be desirable that the International Labour Organisation should in due course establish an international committee for transport questions, it would seem appropriate, in view of the urgency of the questions likely to arise in Europe, to begin by constituting an inland transport committee for Europe on a regional basis.

**Coal Mining.**

Coal mining is another industry which it might be preferable to deal with in the first instance on a European rather than an international basis, in view of the difficulty and urgency of the problems likely to arise in the European coal fields. Such action would, of course, be without prejudice to the establishment of an international committee for the coal mining industry at a later date.

**Metal Trades (including Iron and Steel Production).**

The metal trades, on the other hand, must clearly be dealt with on an international basis and in view of the complexity of their structure more than one committee will probably be required for this purpose.

It is suggested that there might be one committee for iron and steel production, which constitutes a readily separable part of the metal trades as a whole. Iron and steel production has been made the basis of armament manufacture in all the major belligerent countries; wartime needs have led to a great expansion of the industry both in countries in which it was already well established before the war and in countries where it was relatively unimportant before the war; and the industry will be confronted with problems of post-war readjustment of the first order of importance.

The remainder of the metal trades might be considered as a unit, for which one committee would be set up, or separate committees might be constituted for certain well defined parts of it, such as shipbuilding and aircraft and automobile manufacture and allied trades.

A single committee covering all the metal trades other than the production of iron and steel would possibly be unduly large if it were to represent adequately the diversity and complexity of the numerous forms of industrial activity which would be covered.

On the other hand, the post-war problems of the shipbuilding industry and of aircraft and automobile manufacture cannot be considered in isolation; they will be intimately related to development in other branches in the engineering and metal working trades.

It will be for the Governing Body to consider the relative advantages and disadvantages of either solution, namely, whether to begin—

(a) by setting up separate committees for one or other branch—e.g., shipbuilding, aircraft and automobile manufacture—which might later be co-ordinated by a co-ordinating committee, or

(b) by setting up a single committee for all the metal trades other than the production of iron and steel) which would no doubt eventually have to form subcommittees to consider the problems of various branches.

In either case the committee or committees should be on a world-wide basis.

**Textiles.**

The widespread diffusion of the textile industry, the severity of the impact of the war upon it in many countries, the work already done in regard to textiles by the International Labour Organisation and the keen interest which has been shown by the textile trade unions in the establishment
of appropriate international machinery for their industry would all appear to justify the inclusion of textiles in the initial list of industrial committees. In the case of textiles, as in that of the engineering trades, more than one committee will be necessary to cover the industry effectively, and it is suggested that in the first instance there might be two committees, one for cotton and rayon and one for wool, and that any further committees or subcommittees, and any co-operating committee or committees which may be necessary should be constituted at a later date in the light of experience.

The textile committee must clearly be constituted on a world-wide rather than a regional basis.

The early constitution of committees for inland transport, iron and steel production, the engineering trades generally (possibly with special committees for shipbuilding and allied trades and for aircraft and automobile production and allied trades) and the main branches of textiles would appear to represent as ambitious a programme as the Organisation can wisely undertake in the immediate future. As soon as these committees, or such of them as the Governing Body may desire to establish in the first instance, have been organised and have begun their work consideration might be given to the constitution of further committees for such industries as building and civil engineering and the chemical and electrical industries.

**Composition of Committees**

When the Governing Body selects the industries for which committees are to be established in the first instance, it will be necessary for it to fix the initial composition of the committees for these industries. It will be remembered that the British Government's proposal contemplated the constitution of these committees on a bipartite basis. The general trend of opinion at the Conference, however, appeared to be that the committees should generally be tripartite rather than bipartite in character, it being understood that they might deal with matters which concern primarily employers and workers rather than Governments through bipartite subcommittees. No decision has been taken on the matter and the Governing Body must now decide in each case whether the bipartite or tripartite principle is to be applied.

It would seem desirable that the committees should include representatives of all countries with a substantial interest in the industry concerned in the geographical area to which the activities of the committee extend. It will be for the Governing Body to fix the list of countries having a substantial interest in each industry, and the list might no doubt best be determined by applying some objective statistical criterion, such as the volume or value of production or the number of organised workers employed in the industry. In view, however, of the unavailability of satisfactory recent information for many countries at the present time it would seem necessary for the Governing Body to base its decisions in regard to the original composition of the committee on empirical grounds, it being understood that the Governing Body could modify the membership of any committee at any time. This is particularly true since it is clearly impossible to apply a wartime yardstick, to measure the relative importance of industries which have been disorganised as the result of enemy occupation and other wartime conditions. Proposals in regard to the countries which might be represented on the committees which it is suggested should be constituted in the first instance will therefore be found in Annex A to this note.

It would not seem necessary to limit the number of representatives to one from each country in each group, and in view of the complexity of the organisational structure of some industries there might frequently be an advantage in allowing of some flexibility in regard to this matter, subject to the financial considerations mentioned later. It would, however, be necessary, in order to prevent the committees from becoming unduly large, to fix a maximum number of persons who may represent any country in any group; it is suggested that this maximum number might vary with the size of the industry in the different countries, as measured for instance by the number of organised workers employed.

It would not be practicable to have the employers' and workers' representatives on the committees appointed by international electoral colleges, such as the groups of shipowners' and seamen's delegates at maritime sessions of the Conference which elect the members of the Joint Maritime Commission. It would therefore seem to be necessary in practice that the employers' and workers' members of the committees should be appointed either by the Governing Body or by Governments. As it is essential that the appointments should be made in agreement with the organisations concerned and the Governing Body would be unable to form a judgment as to what organisations should be consulted and as to their relative importance in the different countries, it would seem preferable, on the analogy of the constitutional provisions relating to the appointment of workers' and employers' delegates and advisers to the Conference, to leave the Government of each country the responsibility for appointing the employers' and workers' representatives on the committees, in agreement with the principal organisations of employers or workers having a substantial membership engaged in the industry.

It may frequently be convenient to establish national committees to work in close co-operation with the international industrial committees, and where this is done the national committees may afford convenient machinery for the nomination of members of the international committees.

It would seem appropriate that the membership of each committee should include a delegation of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office including equal numbers of representatives from the Government, Employers' and Workers' groups. The number of representatives from each group might vary with circumstances.
In the case of industries where there are well established international organisations of employers or international trade secretariats it may be appropriate to include representatives of such organisations in the membership of the committees.

The above suggestions, if agreed to by the Governing Body, would provide a basis on which the committees might be brought into being. More detailed arrangements concerning the composition and procedure of the committees might be worked out by the committees themselves and embodied in the rules of each committee. It would be desirable to leave it to each committee to frame its own rules, which would be submitted to the Governing Body for approval in so far as they raised any questions of a general character.

Time, Place and Agenda of the First Meeting of Each Committee

Time.

It would seem desirable that a meeting of each of the committees which the Governing Body may decide to establish forthwith should be held as soon as possible after the nominations of the members of the committees have been received from Governments. It would be for each committee to make proposals in regard to the periodicity of future meetings, and the Organisation would presumably wish to meet the desires of the committees in respect within the limits set by the budget.

To establish an exact programme of meetings at the present stage would appear to be impossible in view of the many uncertainties of the situation, and accordingly the most satisfactory arrangement would probably be to give the Acting Director authority to convene a meeting of each committee at an appropriate date next year after consultation with the Officers of the Governing Body and such other consultations as may be necessary.

Place.

If the suggested committees for inland transport and for coal mining are constituted on a European basis the first meetings of these committees should clearly be held either in London or at some appropriate place or places on the continent of Europe. Of the other meetings some might be held in North America and the others in England or continental Europe. If a large programme of meetings is to be arranged in the near future it will be essential to concentrate the meetings at centres where the Office can make the necessary arrangements relatively easily, though it might well be desirable at a later stage that meetings should sometimes be held in large industrial centres closely associated with the industries in question. In this latter event it would of course be desirable when arranging later meetings, at a time when travel is likely to be easier than it can be expected to be during the next twelve months, to distribute the places of meeting more widely over a larger number of countries.

Agenda.

As the industrial committees develop each of them will acquire its own characteristics and interests and their programmes of work, which will naturally tend to become progressively more detailed, will diverge. For the first meetings of the various committees, however, it would seem both possible and desirable to fix a common agenda, subject, perhaps, to some adaptation in the case of inland transport.

It is suggested that this agenda might consist in each case of two items: the social problems of the industry concerned during the period of transition from war to peace, and future international co-operation concerning social policy and its economic foundations in the industry concerned. The first of these items would give the committees an opportunity to consider the immediate social problems of their respective industries, including the prospective employment situation in the industry during the period of reconversion and afterwards, the restoration of pre-war practices, the position of female labour, the re-employment of demobilised persons, the regulation of hours and wages, the maintenance and improvement of wartime welfare arrangements, the maintenance and development of collective bargaining machinery, joint production committees, etc., and similar topics. The emphasis placed on each of these different topics and the extent to which it might be desirable to cover other topics as well would naturally differ from one industry to another according to circumstances. The second of the suggested items would afford an opportunity for the consideration of the future work of the committees and for a preliminary review of the longer-range problems of the various industries.

The Office would endeavour to furnish each of the committees with any available background information which might be useful for its work. Even apart, however, from such transitory difficulties as the fact that much of the necessary information has not been published owing to wartime conditions and that the Office must expect to experience difficulty in recruiting sufficiently qualified staff during the earlier stages, the committees are designed primarily as an instrument of co-operation between their employer and worker members, and until they have themselves worked out programmes of future action which indicate the assistance which the Office can give in the future development of their work the Office can do little more than make arrangements to bring together the parties concerned.
The primary function of the industrial committees during the early stages of their development would be to facilitate exchanges of views between the parties concerned in regard to the problems of their respective industries. As the committees develop they may, however, arrive at decisions and these decisions may assume a variety of forms. In some cases they may find an automatic or semi-automatic application by the organisations of employers and workers in the industry in the different countries or through the national committees to which reference has been made above; or they may recommend action by the International Labour Office, in which case they will, of course, be referred to the Governing Body. In any case the Governing Body will naturally be furnished with a report on each meeting.

**Representation of the Committees on the Governing Body When Their Work is under Review**

It is also suggested that the Governing Body should invite each industrial committee to designate one employer and one worker member to attend on its behalf and participate in Governing Body discussions concerning its work. Such participation in Governing Body proceedings by representatives of the industrial committees, which would not include any voting rights, would be complementary to the participation of Governing Body representatives in the industrial committees and would ensure a two-way liaison between the Governing Body and the committees. Though there would not appear to be any precedent for such an arrangement in the practice of the Governing Body, such a procedure was followed with great advantage by the Council of the League of Nations, which frequently invited representatives of League committees to participate in its proceedings.

**Financial Arrangements for 1945 Meetings**

It would seem desirable to base the financial arrangements for the industrial committees on the practice in regard to meetings of the Governing Body. If this practice should be adopted; Governments would be responsible for the expenses of the Government members of the committees and the Organisation would assume responsibility for the expenses of the employer and worker members. The Organisation would, of course, also assume responsibility for the expenses of the full delegation of the Governing Body. Some limitation of the number of employer and worker members for each country for whom expenses would be paid would be necessary, and it is suggested that a maximum of two members for each country for each group would generally be appropriate, at any rate during the earlier stages of development.

Members of the Governing Body will recall that the budget estimates for 1945, as approved by the Governing Body, do not include any detailed estimate for the expenses of meetings of industrial committees. It was, however, understood that such expenses would be met, if it should be possible to hold the meetings contemplated, out of the Contingencies Fund of 4 2 million francs provided for in the budget. This fund can only be drawn upon with the special authority of the Governing Body. No realistic basis exists on which to compile detailed estimates of the expenses of the proposed meetings, and it is therefore suggested that the Governing Body should authorise the Director to draw upon the Contingencies Fund to the extent of 250,000 francs for the expenses of meetings of the committees, it being understood that the question of the financial provision to be made for such meetings will be reconsidered at the next session of the Governing Body in the light of the experience gained in the interval.

---

**ANNEX A**

**Proposals concerning the Countries to be Represented on the Industrial Committees Which It Is Suggested Might be Established in the First Instance**

As is pointed out in the text of the main note on industrial committees it would seem desirable that each committee should include representatives of all countries with a substantial interest in the industry concerned in the geographical area to which the activities of the committee extend, but this principle could be applied completely without special measures only if the membership of the Organisation were universal.

The lists now submitted to the Governing Body therefore include only countries which are at present Members of the Organisation.

Even as regards Members of the Organisation these lists do not include the names of countries which for the time being appear to be precluded by the circumstances of the war from taking any effective part in the work of the committees. The names of such countries can be added later as it becomes appropriate to make provision for their representation.

---

1 See above, p. 126.
In the case of the proposed European Inland Transport Committee there may be some doubt whether the United Kingdom should be included in the list of countries concerned. On the one hand, the inland transport system of the United Kingdom is hardly an integral part of the continental system. On the other hand, it has a number of close links with the continental system which may become of greater importance in the future, such as the use of train ferries and the use of British ports by vessels primarily engaged in navigation on European inland waterways. Moreover, the primary function of the committee is to develop co-operation between the employers and workers engaged in European inland transport, and the participation in the committee of the United Kingdom, where the employers and workers engaged in transport are strongly organised and have a tradition of such co-operation, would appear to be calculated to make a useful contribution to the attainment of the primary purpose of the committee. The Office has therefore included the United Kingdom in its suggested list of countries which should be represented on this committee.

In the case of European inland transport, and possibly also in certain other cases, it may prove to be important to examine how the problems and conditions of the industry in the whole area to which the activities of the committee extend can be effectively considered.

**European Inland Transport.**
Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Greece, United Kingdom, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Yugoslavia.

**European Coal-mining.**
Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Poland.

**Iron and Steel Production.**
United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, United Kingdom, India, Luxembourg, Sweden, Union of South Africa.

**Engineering Trades.**
United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, United Kingdom, India, Sweden, Switzerland.

**Shipbuilding.**
United States of America, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden.

**Aircraft and Automobile Manufacture and Allied Trades.**
United States of America, Australia, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, United Kingdom, Sweden.

**Textiles.**

**Cotton and Rayon.** United States of America, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, United Kingdom, India, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, Switzerland.

**Wool.** United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, United Kingdom, India, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland.