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A. AGENDA OF THE CONFERENCE

B. INFORMATION ON THE ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

I. Report of the Director-General.

In accordance with the Standing Orders a Report by the Director-General of the International Labour Office will be submitted to the Conference. The opinion has been expressed that the International Labour Conference, while devoting its attention to certain well-defined questions, should also afford an opportunity for the consideration of some topical general problems in the social field. The discussion of the Report of the Director-General affords such an opportunity.

As the central theme of his Report the Director-General will deal with the social implications of technological change, particularly automation and the industrial uses of atomic energy. The Report will also include, as in past years, an analysis of developments in the social field of particular concern to the I.L.O. and an account of I.L.O. activities during the year, with special reference to the main emphases in its work and to new developments in its programme.

II. Financial and Budgetary Questions.

The Conference will be called upon to consider and approve the budget of the International Labour Organisation for 1958 and to deal with any other financial matters that may be brought to its attention in accordance with the Financial Regulations.

III. Information and Reports on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

Article 23 of the Constitution provides that the Director-General shall lay before the Conference a summary of the information and reports communicated to him by governments, in pursuance of articles 19 and 22 of the Constitution, on the measures taken to give effect to the Conventions which they have ratified and on the position in their respective countries with regard to the subject matter of Conventions which they have not ratified, and of Recommendations; article 35 provides that governments which have ratified Conventions shall supply the Director-General with information concerning the application of such Conventions to non-metropolitan territories. The Conference at its 40th Session will have to consider the information and reports supplied by governments in pursuance of the above-mentioned articles of the Constitution, together with the report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations.

IV. Forced Labour (second discussion).

A first discussion on this question took place at the 39th Session. By a resolution adopted on 28 June 1956 the Conference approved as general conclusions, with a view to consultation of governments, proposals for a Convention on forced labour and decided to place the question of forced labour on the agenda of the 40th Session with a view to a final decision on a Convention on this question.

By virtue of this resolution, and in accordance with article 39, paragraphs 6 and 7, of the Standing Orders of the Conference, the Office will communicate to governments a text of a proposed Convention, asking them to state whether they have any amendments to suggest or comments to make. On the basis of their replies the Office will draw up a final report containing the text of a proposed Convention, with any necessary amendments, to serve as a basis of discussion at the 40th Session.

V. Weekly Rest in Commerce and Offices (second discussion).

A first discussion on this question took place at the 39th Session. By a resolution adopted on 26 June 1956 the Conference approved as general conclusions, with a view to consultation of governments, proposals for a Convention and a Recommendation on weekly rest in commerce and offices and decided to place the question of weekly rest in commerce and offices on the agenda of the 40th Session, with a view to final decisions on this question.

By virtue of this resolution, and in accordance with article 39, paragraphs 6 and 7, of the Standing Orders of the Conference, the Office will communicate to governments texts of a proposed Convention and a proposed Recommendation, asking them to state whether they have any amendments to suggest or comments to make. On the basis of their replies the Office will draw up a final report containing the texts of a proposed Convention and a proposed Recommendation, with any necessary amendments, to serve as a basis of discussion at the 40th Session.

1 Section A of the memorandum, which repeats the information contained in the letter of convocation, is not reproduced here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Delegates</th>
<th>Substitutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Mr. de la FUENTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Miss REYES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Ms. da MOTA VEIGA; Mr. RIBEIRO da CUNHA, Mr. DAUN e LORENA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Mr. BERLOGEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Mr. ALBANEZ; substitute: Mr. FUNES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Mr. AGUINAGA TELLERÍA; Mr. AMBLÉS PIPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Mr. HEINRICI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Mr. ACHAKUL; substitute: Mr. SCHLUCHTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Mr. M'ZAH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Mr. ZAICHUK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Mr. ZA-KHAROV; substitute: Mr. ZAKHAROV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>Mr. GOROSHKIN; substitute: Mr. ABRAMOV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Sir Archibald HARRISON; Miss GRACEY, Mr. PECKHAM, MR. MORGAN, MR. COUSINS, MR. KELLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Mr. THURSTON; substitute: Mr. TOBIAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>Mr. PEŠIĆ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deputy Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Delegates</th>
<th>Substitutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Mr. YIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Mr. HEIDAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Delegates</th>
<th>Substitutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Mr. COX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Nigeria</td>
<td>Mr. FOGGON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Mr. GOH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous Republic of Togo</td>
<td>Mr. YWASSA, Mr. SAUVAIRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>Mr. AGUIRRE MARTOS; substitute: Mr. LAMATA MEJÍAS (Spain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employers' Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Delegates</th>
<th>Substitutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Mr. HAFIZULLAH; substitute: Mr. ABUBAKER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Mr. SAMSURI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Mr. JOCKEL; substitute: Mr. BLAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Mr. VAN REMOORTEL; substitute: Mr. GAVÁGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Mr. PENNA e COSTA; substitute: Mr. MORAES FILHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Mr. L. STOYANOV; substitute: Mr. T. STOYANOV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>Mr. CHERNUSHCHENKO; substitute: Mr. SHELDON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Mr. YU; substitute: Mr. TENG, Mr. YIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Mr. DONNADEI; substitute: Mr. TRISTÁN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Mr. GRAU; substitute: Mr. CAMEJO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>Mr. DLUHOŠ; substitute: Mr. DOSTÁL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Mr. WERSHOF; substitute: Miss LORENSEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Mr. LOUTFI; substitute: Mr. SAID SALAMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Mr. RINTE; substitute: Mr. TIKAN-VAARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Mr. CHAILLÉ; substitute: Mr. KELLER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Committee on Forced Labour**

**Government Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Delegates</th>
<th>Substitutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Mr. HAFIZULLAH; substitute: Mr. ABUBAKER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Mr. SAMSURI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Mr. JOCKEL; substitute: Mr. BLAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Mr. VAN REMOORTEL; substitute: Mr. GAVÁGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Mr. PENNA e COSTA; substitute: Mr. MORAES FILHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Mr. L. STOYANOV; substitute: Mr. T. STOYANOV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussia</td>
<td>Mr. CHERNUSHCHENKO; substitute: Mr. SHELDON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Mr. YU; substitute: Mr. TENG, Mr. YIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Mr. DONNADEI; substitute: Mr. TRISTÁN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Mr. GRAU; substitute: Mr. CAMEJO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>Mr. DLUHOŠ; substitute: Mr. DOSTÁL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Mr. WERSHOF; substitute: Miss LORENSEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Mr. LOUTFI; substitute: Mr. SAID SALAMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Mr. RINTE; substitute: Mr. TIKAN-VAARA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Mr. CHAILLÉ; substitute: Mr. KELLER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Republic of Germany: Mr. GELLER; substitute: Mr. BECKER.

Greece: Mr. BENSIS.

Hungary: Mr. WELTNER; substitute: Mrs. BÖKÖR.

Indonesia: Mr. PADMANABHAN; substitute: Mr. ALEXANDER.

Indonesia: Mr. ASTRAWINATA.

Iraq: Mr. GHARIB; substitute: Mr. SARAF.

Ireland: Mr. McMAHON; substitute: Mr. AGNEW.

Italy: Mr. CARLONI.

Japan: Mr. KAWASAKI; substitute: Mr. KAWASHIMA.

Liberia: Mr. MARLAM; substitute: Mr. EL AMIN.

Luxembourg: Mr. van WERVEKE; substitute: Mr. EWEK.

Mexico: Mr. BACA; substitute: Mr. MERIGO.

Morocco: Mr. ZAOUI; substitute: Mr. KAHAD, Mr. GAGNIER.

Netherlands: Mr. van der VEN; substitute: Miss LUNSINGH MEIJER.

New Zealand: Mr. PARSONAGE.

Norway: Mr. ÖKSNES.

Pakistan: Mr. MALIK.

Philippines: Mr. INOCENTES.

Portugal: Mr. FRANCO NOGUEIRA; substitutes: Mr. LICKI, Mrs. RUSU.

Poland: Mr. Hicki; substitutes: MRS. RUSILOW, Mr. ROSSNER.

Portugal: Mr. FRANCO NOGUEIRA; substitutes: Mr. PEIXOTO CORREIA, Mr. PINTO BULL.

Romania: Mr. MEZINCESCO; substitute: Mr. RUSU.

Russia: Mr. ARROYO.

Sudan: Mr. TEFIFIK; substitute: Mr. GADIR YOUSIP.

Sweden: Mr. HEINRICI.

Switzerland: Mr. SAXER; substitute: Mr. Motta.

Syria: Mr. DAHMANE; substitute: Mr. ADEL.

Thailand: Mr. ACHAKUL.

Turkey: Mr. TUNCEL.

Ukraine: Mr. SLIPCHENKO; substitute: Mr. SAPOZHNIKOV.

Union of South Africa: Mr. POTGIETER; substitutes: Mr. GEYSER, Mr. LOOCK.

U.S.S.R.: Mr. SHKUNAEV; substitute: Mr. PASHHERSTNIK.

United Kingdom: Sir Guildhaume YRIDDIN-EVANS; substitutes: Mr. Archibald HARRISON, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. Mnoi.

United States: Mr. BOTHMAN; substitute: Mr. JENKINS.

Uruguay: Mr. PIRIZ COELHO; substitute: Mr. POMES.

Viet-Nam: Mr. NGUYEN-VAN-TONG.

Yugoslavia: Mr. VLADOV; substitutes: Mr. TAPAVIČKI, Mr. PEŠIĆ.

Observers

Barbados: Mr. COX.

Federation of Nigeria: Mr. DOVE-EDWIN.

Sierra Leone: Mr. PANDA.

Singapore: Mr. LIM; substitute: Mr. GOH.

Trinidad: Mr. GRANADO; substitute: Mr. NUNEZ.

Employers' Members

Sir John ALLUM; substitute: Mr. RALPH (New Zealand).

Mr. BERGENSTRÖM; substitutes: Mr. GIESEcke, Mr. LINDESTROM, Mr. CRONQVIST, Mr. NORDHOLM (Sweden).

Mr. CAMPANELLA; substitutes: Mr. BOCCARDI, Mr. MOCHI-ONORI (Italy).

Mr. CAMPBELL; substitutes: Mr. GEORGE, Mr. PURDY (Canada).

Mr. FAUBEL; substitutes: Mr. LOSACKER, Mr. ZIGAN (Federal Republic of Germany).

Mr. GEMMILL; substitutes: Mr. DRUMMOND, Mr. HOUKELD, Mr. MALHERBE (Union of South Africa).

Mr. GIBB; substitutes: Mr. BURNE, Mr. FOWLER (Australia).

Mr. GILLI; substitutes: Mr. MAZZEI (Argentina).

Mr. HENRIKSEN; substitutes: Mr. KLEPP, Mr. GLATVED (Norway).

Mr. KARIKOSKI; substitutes: Mr. GROTFEN, Mr. SJOBEL (Finland).

Mr. O'BRIEN; substitute: Mr. MELLON (Ireland).

Mr. PARKER; substitutes: Mr. TERRELL, Mr. BUGAS (United States).

Mr. PRETO; substitute: Mr. de los RIOS LEITAO (Portugal).

Mr. SIMONOVITCH; substitute: Mr. YANCY (Libya).

Sir Richard SNEDDEN; substitute: Mr. FRASER (United Kingdom).

Mr. TATA; substitute: Mr. DESAI (India).

Mr. VAN LINT; substitute: Mr. GERIN (Belgium).

Mr. WALLNE; substitutes: Mr. SAINTIGNY, Mr. MERMILLOD (France).

Deputy Members

Mr. ABUGROON (Sudan).

Mr. AGUIRRE MARTOS (Spain).

Mr. BAGHAIGHIS (Libya).

Mr. GHAYOUR; substitute: Mr. ROHANI (Iran).

Mr. HAUSMAN (Israel).

Mr. ISMAIL (Pakistan).

Mr. JADIR (Iraq).

Mr. JANUSZEWICZ (Poland).

Mr. KANEV (Bulgaria).

Mr. KUNTSCHEN; substitutes: Mr. DUBOIS, Mr. SCHERRER (Switzerland).

Mr. LOUTFI; substitute: Mr. ALI (Egypt).

Mr. MACHADO NETO; substitutes: Mr. GONZALES BLANCO, Mr. MAIA (Brazil).

Mr. MARIC (Yugoslavia).

Mr. VUONG-MINH-CHAU (Viet-Nam).

Observers

Mr. HOTCHKISS (Trinidad).

Mr. MANDEVILLE (Barbados).

Workers' Members

Mr. ANDERSEN (Norway).

Mr. BEERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany).

Mr. BORAN (Ireland).

Mr. CARCEDO (Argentina).

Mrs. CHUNHACHANDANA (Thailand).

Mr. CRONIN (United States).

Mr. DEZEL DING (Egypt).

Mr. MACHADO NETO; substitutes: Mr. GONZALES BLANCO, Mr. MAIA (Brazil).

Mr. MARIAMI; substitute: Mr. EL AMIN.

Mr. MASHADO NETO (South Africa).

Mr. O'BRIEN; substitute: Mr. MELLON (United Kingdom).

Mr. PADMANABHAN; substitute: Mr. DESAI (India).

Mr. VAN LINT; substitute: Mr. GERIN (Belgium).

Mr. WALLNE; substitutes: Mr. SAINTIGNY, Mr. MERMILLOD (France).
Mr. MADSEN (Denmark).
Mr. MALLÁT (Hungary).
Mr. MOHAMEDI (Belgium).
Mr. MUKAI (Japan).
Mr. MUKHERJEE (Byelorussia).
Mr. NEL (Union of South Africa).
Mrs. NOVIKOVA (Byelorussia).
Mr. ÖZKANER (Turkey).
Mr. PEQUENO (Brazil).
Mr. PÉREZ GONZÁLEZ (Cuba).
Mr. PRENDIVILLE (New Zealand).
Mr. SHVACHKO (Ukraine).
Mr. ŠIJAN (Yugoslavia).
Mr. SMITH (Liberia).
Mr. TAN (Philippines).
Mr. TLILI (Tunisia).
Mr. UOTI (Finland).
Mr. VENTEJOL (France).
Mr. WHITE (Australia).
Mr. WISZKIELIS (Poland).

Deputy Members

Mr. ACUÑA (Uruguay).
Mr. BEARD (United Kingdom).
Mr. DELANEY (United States).
Mr. FARRELL (Ireland).
Mr. FERNÁNDEZ CELA (Spain).
Mr. GUTIÉRREZ REYES (Chile).
Mr. HARAGUCHI (Japan).
Mr. LIANG (China).
Mr. OSMAN (Sudan).
Mr. RAZAFIMBAHINY (France).
Mr. SALAMA (Egypt).
Mr. SHIRAZI (Pakistan).
Mr. TADGE (Federal Republic of Germany).
Mr. TERZIEV (Bulgaria).
Mr. VONDRÁŠ (Czechoslovakia).
Mr. WIN (Burma).

Observers

Mr. REHLING, Mr. MILHAUD (United Nations).

Chairman

Mr. SAXER.

Vice-Chairmen

Mr. O'BRIEN.
Mr. GEDDES.

REPORTER

Mr. ÖKSNES.

Technical Experts

Mr. BERNARD; substitute: Mr. VELTRVSKY.
(International Commission against Concentration Camp Practices).

Committee on Weekly Rest

Government Members

Afghanistan: Mr. Abubaker; substitute: Mr. Hafizullah.
Argentina: Mr. JONES.
Australia: Mr. HEMPEL; substitute: Mrs. CARMINE.
Belgium: Mr. PARMENTIER; substitute: Mr. Defalque.
Brazil: Mr. Lopes Sussekind.
Byelorussia: Mr. Astapenko.
Canada: Mr. WILLSON.
Chile: Mr. ONFRAY.
Costa Rica: Mr. López Martínez; substitute: Mr. Grau.
Czechoslovakia: Mr. Strnad.
Denmark: Mrs. PiHL.
Egypt: Mr. FAHIM.
France: Mr. MEUNIER.
Federal Republic of Germany: Mr. BÖHM.
Honduras: Mr. Martínez Augustinus.
Iceland: Mr. Olafsson.
India: Mr. SAEHAY; substitute: Mr. Merani.
Indonesia: Mr. Soefian Tsoeri; substitute: Mr. Siregar.
Iran: Mr. Azimi; substitute: Mr. TaFAZZOLI.
Iraq: Mr. al Pachachi; substitute: Mr. Sarafa.
Ireland: Miss Beere.
Israel: Mr. Raday.
Italy: Mr. PURPURA; substitute: Mr. Montevecchi.
Japan: Mr. SUZUKI; substitute: Mr. Hosono.
Lebanon: Mr. ABI-RAAD.
Liberia: Mr. NEBO.
Libya: Mr. MARIAMI.
Luzembourg: Mr. THOMA.
Mexico: Mr. BUSTILLOS CARRILLO; substitute: Mr. BACA GARCÍA de ALBA.
Netherlands: Mr. Eldering.
Norway: Mr. ULSAKER.
Pakistan: Mr. Naimuddin.
Peru: Mr. ORTIZ DE ZEVALLOS; substitute: Mr. SALAS.
Philippines: Mr. Santos.
Portugal:
El Salvador: Mr. FUNES.
Spain: Mr. AMBLÉS PIPO.
Sweden: Mr. RUNE.
Switzerland: Mrs. SCHWARZ-GAGG; substitute: Mr. RYFFEL.
Syria: Mr. DAIMANE; substitute: Mr. TOMEH.
Thailand: Mr. ACHAKUL.
Tunisia: Mr. CHERIF.
Turkey:
U.S.S.R: Mr. Borisov.
United Kingdom: Sir Archibald Harrison; substitute: Mr. HUME.
United States: Mrs. Leopold; substitute: Mr. Finch.
Uruguay:

Observers

Barbados:
Jamaica:
Federation of Nigeria:
Singapore:
Italian Trust Territory of Somaliland:
Trinidad:

Employers' Members

Mr. Achour; substitute: Mr. Boukhris (Tunisia).
Mr. Aye (Burma).
THIRD SITTING

Thursday, 6 June 1957, 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Holt

FIRST REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE:
SUBMISSION AND ADOPTION

The President—I declare open the Third Sitting and I call upon Mr. Migone, Chairman of the Selection Committee, to present the first report of that Committee.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. MIGONE (Government delegate, Argentina; Chairman of the Selection Committee)—I have pleasure in submitting the first report of the Selection Committee, the text of which has already been distributed.

The President—Is there any objection to the adoption of the report? If not, I declare the report adopted.

(The report is adopted.)

SECOND REPORT OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE:
SUBMISSION AND ADOPTION

The President—The next item on the agenda for this afternoon is the second report of the Selection Committee. I call on Mr. Migone, Chairman of the Committee, to present the report.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. MIGONE (Government delegate, Argentina; Chairman of the Selection Committee)—I have the honour to submit the second report of the Selection Committee. It refers to the composition of the Conference Committees.

The figures proposed for the composition of the Committees will be read by the Clerk of the Conference. Approval will be subject to a reservation, that requests made by the Employers' delegates from Eastern Europe will be considered at a meeting to be held in the near future with a view to a subsequent decision.

1 See Appendix I, p. 571.

The President—I will ask the Clerk of the Conference to read the details indicated by Mr. Migone.

The Clerk of the Conference—The figures proposed by the Selection Committee for the membership of the Conference Committees are as follows:

Standing Orders Committee: 20 members (12 Government members, 4 Employers' members and 4 Workers' members).

Resolutions Committee: 54 members (36 Government members, 6 Employers' members and 12 Workers' members).

Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations: 56 members (36 Government members, 8 Employers' members and 12 Workers' members).

Committee on Forced Labour: 108 members (54 Government members, 18 Employers' members and 36 Workers' members).

Committee on Weekly Rest: 100 members (50 Government members, 25 Employers' members and 25 Workers' members).

Committee on Indigenous Populations: 40 members (24 Government members, 8 Employers' members and 8 Workers' members).

Committee on Discrimination: 102 members (48 Government members, 18 Employers' members and 36 Workers' members).

Committee on Plantations: 60 members (30 Government members, 10 Employers' members and 20 Workers' members).

Finally, the Finance Committee of Government Representatives, which under the Standing Orders of the Conference must be composed of one Government representative from each Member represented at the Conference, will be set up later.

As regards the lists of names of the members of each of the Committees, these lists will be published in the Provisional Record as an annex to the present report and delegates will be able to take note of them.

1 See Appendix I, p. 572.
TWENTY-SECOND SITTING

Friday, 21 June 1957, 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Jodoin

Report of the Committee on Forced Labour: Submission, Discussion and Adoption

The President (Mr. Jodoin)—The first item on our agenda for this morning is the report of the Committee on Forced Labour. I would like to ask Mr. Saxer, the Chairman of the Committee, and Mr. Öksnes, the Reporter, to come to the platform. I call upon Mr. Öksnes to present his report.

Mr. Öksnes (Government delegate, Norway; Reporter of the Committee on Forced Labour)—I have the honour to present the report of the Committee on Forced Labour, the text of which has already been distributed to delegates. I do not think it is necessary for me to make any long statement concerning this report. I should like, however, to stress the fact that the Committee decided at the outset of its work to concentrate on the primary task of drafting an international instrument which would command the fullest possible support in the Committee and would be likely to secure the widest possible ratification and application thereafter. The Committee adhered strictly to this objective throughout the whole of its discussions and avoided any polemics and I very much hope that the Conference will deal with the matter in the same spirit.

At the beginning of the Committee's work several members stressed the necessity for showing a spirit of compromise and not insisting on amendments which, although they might be considered important by quite a number of members, were opposed by a number of others and might make it difficult for certain countries to ratify the Convention finally adopted. As a result, the text of the Convention proposed by the Committee does not contain certain clauses to which a number of members attached considerable importance, and it does contain certain clauses to which some members are inclined to take exception. Nevertheless I should like to point out that the text now before you was adopted by the Committee by 278 votes to 0, with 4 abstentions.

In view of the virtual unanimity of the Committee in favour of the text which is now before you, I would venture to express the hope that we can reach a similar degree of unanimity in the Conference and that you will all adopt this report and the texts which accompany it. If this Convention is adopted unanimously by the Conference this will represent a great step forward towards the goal which we all have in mind—the complete abolition of forced labour everywhere in the world.

But if this result is to be achieved, we will not have fulfilled our responsibilities simply by voting in favour of the Convention today and on the final vote. To be a forceful instrument in the hands of our Organisation it is necessary that the Convention be subsequently ratified and applied by the great majority of member States. I should like to make an appeal to all delegates personally to see to it that when they return to their own countries they do everything in their power to ensure the earliest possible ratification and implementation by their governments of the provisions which they have helped to draft here and which seem certain to be adopted by an overwhelming majority, or perhaps even unanimously.

The President (Mr. Jodoin)—I now declare open the general discussion on the report of the Committee on Forced Labour.

Interpretation from French: Mr. Bahrami (Government Adviser, Iran)—The Government delegation of Iran has the honour to express very briefly its views with regard to the proposed Convention on the abolition of forced labour which is submitted for your approval. The abolition of forced labour is certainly the corner-stone of social peace and justice and of the freedoms to which we are so attached. The existence of this kind of labour in any country will certainly prevent that country from ratifying and applying a large number of international labour Conventions dealing with human rights. Among them we might note the most important—the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948, and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949. These Conventions have a direct bearing on human rights and we thank the Director-General for laying stress on them in Chapter III of his Eleventh Report to the United Nations. Indeed, no social progress, no raising of living standards and no policy of good human relations can be carried out without ensuring first of all the freedom of the workers in the widest sense.
The Government of Iran, which has ratified the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, considers that all forms of forced labour are a flagrant violation of human rights, and not only certain forms of forced or compulsory labour, as mentioned in the preamble of the proposed Convention submitted to you now. New Conventions certainly constitute definite progress towards abolition of the flagrant and important cases of forced labour which still exist, but we consider that the central standard and, if I may coin a phrase, the mother law is still the Forced Labour Convention, 1930.

This Convention has the advantage of giving a general definition which covers all forms of forced labour and which is indeed not exclusive of any kind. Thus while supporting the new Convention on the abolition of forced labour, which my Government will submit immediately to Parliament for adoption and ratification, and while congratulating warmly the members of the Committee and its distinguished Chairman and Reporter, I would like to take this opportunity to direct the attention of the Director-General to the importance we attach to revision of the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, and the need for placing that item on the agenda of the next session of the International Labour Conference.

Mr. DESAI (Employers' adviser, India)—On behalf of the employers of India I wish to make a statement on the report of the Committee on Forced Labour. The free employers of our country, which believes in high ethical standards of human life, are one with all the progressive forces in the world which are anxious to see that all forms of forced labour are brought to an end in all parts of the world as early as possible, and they have contributed their due share in shaping the proposed Convention which is placed before you. However, there is one factor in this connection to which I have to allude.

The Government of our country, moved, in the Committee, an amendment for the deletion of subparagraph (d) of Article 1, under which ratifying Members would undertake to suppress and not to make use of any form of forced or compulsory labour "as a punishment for having participated in strikes", from which it appears that it feels that retention of this paragraph will raise technical difficulties in ratifying the Convention. The Government of Japan concurred in this. We on behalf of the employers of India also felt that technical difficulties should not come in the way of ratifying such an important historic Convention by countries, like ours, who are champions of the democratic rule of life.

The majority of the members of the Committee felt, however, that deletion of subparagraph (d) of Article 1 was not called for, and it finds a place in the draft before you. Therefore before falling in line with the general trend of thinking we believe it necessary to clarify our viewpoint and bona fides in the matter.

You will naturally ask us what technical difficulties are apprehended, and we are bound to tell you and satisfy you about our bona fides in the matter.

Our Constitution provides for the prohibition of all forms of forced labour, and nobody ever thinks of using forced labour for any purpose, much less as punishment. However, our country's industrial labour-management relations law provides that illegal strikes and lockouts are punishable in certain cases by imprisonment. Such imprisonment may involve prison labour, and the use of the words "compulsory labour" in the text of Article 1, it may be contended, should be interpreted to include compulsory labour in prison, that is prison labour, with the result that ratification of the Convention may affect our national labour laws. Nobody in India, much less we the employers who represent enlightened free enterprise, questions the rights of labour, nor do we desire to use forced labour, as it is usually understood, as a punishment. Our desire is to point out the technical difficulties, so that we may not be misunderstood in this forum.

We are glad to note that representatives of the Workers appreciated this, and I would draw your attention to paragraph 14 of the report, lines 23 to 26: "The workers agreed even that in certain circumstances penalties could be imposed for participation in illegal strikes and that these penalties might include normal prison labour."

In view of this clarification we feel that we may also join all other progressive forces in supporting this historic Convention, as set out in the draft placed before you, and we hope and pray that it will serve as a beacon light in the onward march on the path of human progress. Hence our vote in favour of the report.

Mr. LIANG (Workers' delegate, China)—In the name of the Chinese workers I wish to express my appreciation of the report of the Committee on Forced Labour, which calls for the adoption by this Conference of a Convention on the abolition of forced labour wherever it is in existence. I consider the adoption of this Convention will represent one of the most important achievements of the I.L.O. for the protection of labour rights, for which purpose it was created. I wish therefore to take this opportunity to congratulate the Organisation as a whole, as well as those who have taken part in the work involved.

The proposed text, as we can all see, contains only two operative articles for the suppression of forced labour in five given forms. It is a short and concise Convention and can be enforced without the slightest confusion. It is, however, very desirable to point out the significance of this vital instrument.

The motive behind the general desire for the adoption of such an instrument is based on the fact that there exist in some countries certain new and vicious forms of forced labour, to which attention was drawn in the report of the Joint United Nations-I.L.O. Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labour. Therefore the first three forms of forced labour in the text—as a means of political coercion, as a method of mobilisation of labour for the purposes of economic development, and as a means of labour discipline—constitute the central theme and primary elements of the new instrument.
You will certainly understand that in saying this I do not mean to minimise the importance of the remaining two forms of forced labour—as a punishment for participation in strikes and as a means of racial, social, national or religious discrimination. I believe we all realise that the use of forced labour as a means of political coercion, for economic mobilisation and for labour discipline are the most vicious in nature and the most prevalent in many parts of the world.

As the inquiry conducted by the Joint Ad Hoc Committee revealed that these new and vicious forms of forced labour are mainly practised in the Communist totalitarian countries, we shall not be surprised to find that the conclusions to propose for such an instrument have not been reached without serious obstacles—direct or indirect, open or camouflaged—in an attempt to distract public attention from the main objective and to weaken the strength of the instrument.

The U.S.S.R. Government delegate, in his speech on the fifth report of the Selection Committee, said that the Employers' representatives of the capitalist countries have come here to struggle against the representatives of the workers to improve working conditions. I do not know if it is true, but I can hardly believe that those people from the Communist countries, where human slavery is a normal institution and a daily practice, have come here really to uphold human rights and to work sincerely for the abolition of "all forms of forced labour". Certainly, they have come under various pretexts to undermine the efforts of freedom-loving people who are doing their utmost to eliminate these vicious and wicked evils of mankind.

It goes without saying that the Convention cannot itself produce results unless it is widely ratified and enforced by member States. I would like, therefore, to take this opportunity to appeal to member States to make a vigorous effort in order to secure prompt ratification and effective enforcement and thus manifest their sincere desire to uphold human dignity and social justice. As the Workers' representative of Free China, I pledge myself to press for this Convention to be ratified and enforced in my country. I must confess that I cannot see how this Convention can bring real benefit to our fellow workers on the Chinese mainland without first wiping out the Communist régime, whose very existence can never be separated from the use of slave labour. It may be appropriate for me to say on this occasion that we are building up our strength for the complete emancipation of our countrymen on the Chinese mainland and we firmly believe that we shall succeed in this crusade for the freedom of the enslaved workers.

I cannot conclude my observations without registering my satisfaction with the three resolutions submitted in connection with the proposed Convention. These resolutions, when adopted, will bring force to the Convention and add to the effectiveness of its enforcement. It is of such concern to the free world that the proposal put forward by the United States Government last year covering measures which would have prohibited the products of forced labour in international trade and commerce has not been brought forth for consideration. It is even more deplorable that the draft resolution submitted by Mr. Delaney, the Workers' delegate of the United States, calling for a decision to continue the existence of the Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labour, was also not discussed in the Committee. Although the proposal was submitted at a late hour of the Committee meeting, it was closely related to the proposed Convention and absolutely receivable according to the Standing Orders. But as a result of a Communist political manœuvre of rushing in some more seemingly relevant resolutions the Committee meeting was called off without having discussed the merits of the proposal.

It is very clear to all of us that the proposal, which would facilitate further collection and reporting of information concerning the abuses of forced labour, is very important and had been submitted in good faith by the United States Workers' delegate. I sincerely hope that this proposal will be further considered by the Governing Body for an appropriate decision to be taken in order to enable the I.L.O. and member States to take the necessary measures regarding this serious problem which is of so much concern to the free world.

Mr. PARKER (Employers' delegate, United States)—I have come to this platform for two reasons. First, to make clear the attitude of United States employers with respect to the question of forced labour. I categorically state that without exception, United States employers have been and continue to be relentlessly opposed to the unspeakable evil of forced labour.

We abhor forced labour because it is a total rejection and suppression of the God-given rights of all human beings to live in dignity and freedom, and in the light of their own conscience.

We believe above all else that this revolting practice is a vicious crime against all humanity, regardless of race, creed or colour.

Accordingly, we endorse the objectives of this instrument. We earnestly hope that these objectives will be accomplished and that the iniquitous practice of forced labour will be wiped for ever from the face of the globe.

Let us hope that the hearts of those in power who have forsaken all vestiges of decency and humanity by degrading mankind through the use of forced labour will listen to world opinion and eliminate this godless practice.

The second reason relates to the form of the instrument now before us—i.e. a Convention. This is of great concern to us.

Being a federal-state Government we cannot ignore the constitutional requirements of our country and the difficulties confronting us in consideration of any international instrument which deals with strictly domestic problems.

The employers of the United States support the principle that it is inappropriate to embody in an international draft treaty provisions governing the relationship of an individual to his own Government. We believe that international treaties are proper only when they deal with the relationship of a national or his government to foreign citizens or their governments.
I too support those views; and I should say to you that if an instrument such as that before us should be submitted to our Senate for ratification—the employers of the United States, I among them, will unalterably oppose its ratification.

I have one more word on this point. As I have said, treaties are properly agreements between governments whereby one government agrees to accord to another government or its nationals certain treatment in return for like treatment for itself or its nationals. Is there anyone here whose moral perception has sunk so low as to believe that governments may continue forced labour unless they get an agreement from others guilty of that unspeakable practice to abolish it?

But even if these reasons were not valid, there is another cogent point which should be clear to all of us. This instrument comes before you with the cynical support of the U.S.S.R. and its satellites. Everyone here, including their delegates, knows where forced labour exists today: behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Everyone here knows that their support for this instrument is thoroughly and disgracefully dishonourable; that they will shout from the housetops that they will ratify the instrument, and seek to point the finger at the free nations as the violators of the instrument; and will cynically go their way continuing forced labour in all its forms so long as the ruling clique determines that it is necessary to maintain their power.

I cannot and will not associate myself in this matter with those responsible for the rape of Hungary, of which Mr. Delaney spoke so feelingly to this Conference yesterday. Such cynical, hypocritical conduct appals me, and I refuse to be a party to it. Accordingly, I cannot support the instrument in its present form and therefore I shall abstain.

Interpretation from French: Mr. WISZ-KIELIS (Workers' adviser, Poland)—I should like in this general discussion on the report of the Committee on Forced Labour to bring to you the standpoint of the Polish Workers' delegation. The Conference is required to decide on the report together with the proposed Convention and three resolutions regarding forced labour which are the product of much hard work on the part of the Committee. During its proceedings there were sometimes heated discussions, but usually they ended with constructive conclusions which were acceptable to the majority.

In appreciating the work done last year and this year by the Forced Labour Committees, we should express our satisfaction at being about to adopt a new Convention concerning the abolition of forced and compulsory labour, the contents and scope of which have been discussed with a great deal of sense of responsibility on the part of all members of the Committee. I stress the words "sense of responsibility" because the abolition of forced and compulsory labour, the immediate abolition of all forms of forced labour everywhere where they may be found, has been and still is the major preoccupation of the workers and their unions and should also be the major preoccupation of all governments which in fact and in law bear responsibility in this regard.

On the basis of this consideration we have to ask ourselves the following question: Have we, as Workers, done everything we could have done in order to enable the Convention to make an effective contribution to the complete suppression of all forms of forced labour? In the name of the Workers, I can say that both last year and this year we have made efforts to cover, in the Convention we discussed and framed, the greatest possible number of typical forms of forced labour.

In this connection I must say that we greatly regret the fact that the text of the proposed Convention now before the Conference is weakened as compared with the text of the draft Convention adopted in the first discussion at the 39th Session. I am talking about subparagraph (f) of the Convention; the Article starts by stating that "Every Member of the International Labour Organisation which ratifies this Convention undertakes to suppress and not to make use of any form of forced or compulsory labour—" and the old subparagraph (f) adds—

"(f) as a consequence of the method of payment to the worker whereby his employer defers payment to a given date or postpones payment after the agreed date, thereby depriving the worker of a genuine possibility of terminating his employment, or where work is exacted from the worker in the form of bondage for debts or through systems of peonage."

This subparagraph was adopted last year by the Conference and is not now in the proposed Convention, and we must express our keen regret that in drafting the Convention at the second occasion regard was not had to the desire expressed by the Conference last year and by a number of governments, who declared themselves in favour of the retention of this subparagraph (f) when consulted during the intervening period. During the deliberations of the Committee the Workers were unanimously in favour of re-introducing this subparagraph (f) in the text of the Convention but, despite the support of some governments, this demand by the Workers was not satisfied.

Starting from the principle that all forms of forced labour everywhere should immediately be suppressed, we think that the text of the Convention as it now stands does not provide all the indispensable guarantees for immediate and complete abolition of all forms of forced labour. The Convention, of course, covers some of the more flagrant forms of forced labour, but there still remain a multitude of various forms of forced labour, one of the most current and widespread of which was defined in subparagraph (f) which unfortunately has not been retained.

Despite the weaknesses of the present proposed Convention, we consider that the drafting of this international document has made it possible to bring out the fact that the problem of forced labour is not yet completely solved and that we shall have to make persevering efforts to solve this problem once and for all. The adoption of this instrument,
incomplete though it be, will be a positive contribution by this session of the Conference to the abolition of forced labour. We think that the adoption of this instrument, its ratification and application by the governments, including the federal States, will be welcomed by the workers of the world.

That is why, although the Convention does not give us full satisfaction from the Workers' point of view, the Workers' delegation from Poland is prepared to vote in favour of its adoption since it is, after all, a big step forward towards the complete and total abolition of forced labour.

We hope that the International Labour Organisation will take all necessary action to promote ratification in the shortest possible time of the 1930 Convention and that which will be adopted this year. Furthermore, we are profoundly convinced that early ratification of these Conventions on forced labour and their practical application depend to a large extent on concerted action by the workers in their unions both at the national and at the international level. Such united action may exert a positive influence on governments for ratification and application of the Forced Labour Conventions.

In closing, I should like once more to stress that we shall vote in favour of the documents now before us.

Mr. JAWAD (Government adviser, Iraq)—At the Committee stage the Iraqi delegation voted for the proposed Convention on forced labour and will vote again for its adoption by the General Conference. It is hardly necessary to repeat here our great interest, as well as the interest of all civilised countries, in the adoption of such a Convention. We wish, however, to go on record with regard to certain points which we believe must be kept in mind for future reference in connection with the Convention's implementation.

We invite attention in particular to the relationship of the Forced Labour Convention to the United Nations Convention on Genocide. Article 1 of the proposed Convention on forced labour has laid down a new definition of forced labour. The various forms which have been referred to in the five paragraphs of Article 1 have provided ample indications as to the fields in which forced labour could exist. On the other hand these categories or forms under which forced labour could exist in certain areas and be practised by certain authorities are general in nature and may lend themselves to various interpretations. Nevertheless, our belief in the good faith of Members of the International Labour Organisation which ratify this Convention makes us trust that efforts will be made to suppress completely and not to make use of any form of forced or compulsory labour.

This, in fact, is the spirit which has emerged from the discussions at the last session of the Conference as well as at the present session. The noble and lofty purposes of the Convention have been clearly understood and emphatically stated by the three groups. This is a happy state which marks a wide step forward in implementing the objectives of the International Labour Organisation in this particular field. This Organisation is one of the agencies of the United Nations. The conclusions it reaches and the decisions it takes should not only supplement decisions and conventions passed by the United Nations but should also create or ratify international conventions on principles laid down by the Charter of that Organisation in so far as the International Labour Organisation's field of competence is concerned.

In this connection I should like to invite your attention for a minute to subparagraph (e) of Article 1 of the proposed Convention, which reads as follows: "as a means of racial, social, national or religious discrimination.

In this clause the word "discrimination" seems to bother us a little. Forced labour, as is well known, is usually performed in confinement in conditions which affect the physical wellbeing of the worker subjected to forced or compulsory labour. To suppress the institution of forced labour, as is the purpose and the objective of this proposed Convention, is to reject as fallacious the assumption, which has lived too long into the present day, that these workers live in normal conditions of life and work. Thus we feel that the word "discrimination" is too weak to describe the tragedy of forced labour from economic, social and humanitarian points of view.

Discrimination usually has two aspects—positive and negative. On the positive side it presupposes allotting more favours to one group to the prejudice of another group. The basic social stock from which these favours are being taken must be of a positive nature. In this sense one could speak, for example, about discrimination in education, in religion, in employment. Forced labour represents the negative side and it is therefore an evil in itself. It represents the action directed at weakening certain sections of the population economically, physically and racially. This is only the first step in a more complicated process. Our concern with matters of labour should not make us overlook the fact that forced labour is only one aspect of a wider and more complicated problem, namely the weakening and/or the destruction of certain peoples of particular racial, religious or national characteristics.

This wide problem has been for a long time the concern and interest of other international bodies, in particular the United Nations. In 1948 the General Assembly of the United Nations finally adopted the Convention on Genocide. This Convention has been ratified by 55 States. It may be useful for future understanding and implementation of the Forced Labour Convention that we should recall at this juncture that this Convention in no way prejudices or limits the principles laid down in the Genocide Convention. I should like to draw attention in particular to Article II of the Genocide Convention, which prohibits destruction of national, racial, ethnic or religious groups. Article II of that Convention defines genocide and among the points
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Mr. O'BRIEN (Employers' delegate, Ireland) —When we approached the question of forced 
labour last year, the tripartite Committee— and I think this Conference—directed itself 
very deliberately to a frontal attack on what is probably the greatest evil in the world at this 
time. There was unanimity that this Organisation as well as others should at least do what was in its power to contribute towards the abolition and complete elimination of forced 
labour. This year, continuing its work with the purpose of bringing an instrument before this 
Conference, the Committee concentrated largely on the same objective. The keynote in the work of the Committee was, with some few exceptions, that we should produce an instrument for the Conference which would be short, which would be concise and which would be effective.

I am one of those who on many occasions have found it necessary to express my disfavour of the extent to which the I.L.O. directs itself towards the creation of Conventions and I have often expressed the opinion that the I.L.O. could more effectively do its work and with more benefit in more practical fields of performance. 

I am quite satisfied, however, that in regard to a question such as forced labour the Interna­tional Labour Organisation has no option but to adopt a Convention and to make that 
Convention as effective as possible. I had some misgivings, and still have, in regard to the fact that the instrument we have produced in the Committee for the Conference is not as short or concise as we had hoped it would be. We were generally of the opinion that subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of Article 1 adequately and effectively covered those forms of forced labour towards which the Committee was directing its attention. Two other clauses have been introduced with the principles of which and the substance of which nobody could disagree. There are misgivings, however, in the minds of some of us as to the appropriateness of including these clauses in this particular instrument.

The reason why I raise this point now is not to express my opposition or intended opposition to these clauses but to mention something which certainly is disturbing my mind and, I know, the minds of a good many others. That is the fact that there are two clauses at least one of which is capable of causing confu­sion, and not only capable of causing confusion but capable of being used to cause confusion. I wish to stress the necessity for studying carefully the debate in the Committee as outlined in the report indicating the precise effect of these clauses in the instrument and the intention which brought about their inclusion by the vote of the Committee. They were not intended to confuse and they are not there to give anybody, any ill-intentioned government, the facility for using confusion to evade its responsibilities under the instrument. 

The Polish Workers' delegate from this rostrum a few moments ago told you of his dis­appointment that the instrument did not contain more specific details and clauses as to forms of forced labour. That is precisely what the Committee has achieved in this particular instrument. The Polish Workers' delegate from this rostrum a few moments ago told you of his dissatisfaction in regard to the interpretation of its deliberations—efforts to bring so many detailed clauses into the instrument that it would be rendered difficult of ratification. Under no circumstances could we accept for a moment the sincerity of those who pretend that the extension, by way of clause after clause, of this instrument could render it more effective: That is just purely and simply a deception.

In regard to the Convention itself, we Employ­ers hope that it will be voted in by this 
Conference. We hope that it will secure speedy
ratification. We have our doubts as to the effect of the ratification, because afterwards it is the implementation, of course, and the implementation, which is the real point.

This Conference has before it, and has had for some time, voluminous, documented, incontrovertible evidence that behind the Iron Curtain forced labour is in continuous use. We have no evidence or assurance of any intention to abolish forced labour in those places. It does not look as if we will ever get the opportunity to know whether or not steps are being taken to abolish it there. We have the experience within the last few months of the contemptuous manner in which the fact-finding committee of the United Nations and the Governing Body of the I.L.O. were treated by the so-called Hungarian Government but installed by Russian armed force, when they refused the request that an on-the-spot fact-finding commission might operate. That is what makes me feel somewhat cynical, may I say, as to the hopes that this Convention will bring about the concrete practical results which we all seek—in the free countries at any rate.

Having said this I still feel that the International Labour Organisation, by virtue of its nature, by virtue of its association with the United Nations, by virtue of the fact that it is above all things an organisation which seeks for the human freedom—freedom which—far above politics, above diplomacy, above the many things that have to be debated upon and taken into consideration in the United Nations—this Organisation which concerns itself solely with the social and human aspects of freedom, with its peculiar personality as an organisation, must obviously give its full and enthusiastic support and keen following up to an instrument of this kind.

I would ask, therefore, two things: first, that we vote this Convention in; second, that the International Labour Organisation never will relax its vigilance in regard to this most decadent evil, which we know to be in existence, and that we will follow it through, giving our practical support, our moral support and our support in every way to the abolition of this evil.

I would be failing in my duty if, as Employers' Vice-Chairman of the Committee, I did not briefly express my gratitude to our Chairman and to our Reporter for the admirable way in which they helped the Committee to bring into being this instrument, which is the best we could produce with unanimity from all groups.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. ARUTIU-NIAN (Government delegate, U.S.S.R.)—For two years now the International Labour Organisation has dealt with questions connected with the abolition of forced labour. The Soviet Union from the very first moment took up a consistent attitude of supporting all efforts directed by the Organisation towards the abolition of forced labour, wherever it exists and in all its forms. Of course, some people do not like our doing so, but we do not act according to whether or not certain representatives like our way of acting.

The International Labour Organisation, first of all, must demand from its Members that they should ratify those Conventions which have a general significance for all States Members of this Organisation. Ratification implies consistent application of the provisions and requirements of these Conventions. I would say that whoever does not ratify and comply with the requirements of a Convention has absolutely no moral foundation to speak from this rostrum, or from any other place, preaching that others should ratify and comply with that Convention. That is the role in which we have seen here the representative of the United States employers. He does not conceal the fact that he is against this Convention. Well, nobody expected him to be in favour of it—it was indeed a superfluous statement—but in order to conceal his hostile attitude to the Convention he was stalling and keeping all sorts of philosophical considerations.

First of all, he did not even stop at appealing to God and spoke of the God-given dignity of man and respect for that dignity, irrespective of race, colour or creed. Gentlemen, every one of us knows that it is the representatives of the employers, of the exploiting classes of America, who are the supporters of the retention of those traces of slavery that are still to be found in that country. We know that the democratic forces of the United States are struggling against these remnants of slavery, which include racial discrimination, debt bondage and the use of forced labour of Mexican and Puerto Rican workers. We have the greatest sympathy for the struggle of the democratic elements in the United States against this. That is a historically-created condition which still prevails in that country; yet the employers of the United States of course take advantage of it. They do so in a twofold manner. First, it gives them tremendous profits. The Negro and other workers are paid considerably less than white workers in the United States. That is a very considerable source of profit. Moreover, the segregation of the employers makes it easy to put pressure on the standard of living of the white workers and lower their wages. That also is an additional source of profit. Thus, the employers are very interested in this, and they are resisting the democratic forces of their own country which are attempting to do away with these forms of forced labour.

In recent years, we all know very well that there has developed a great movement in that country against these forms of labour unworthy of man, and we welcome this movement and are convinced that it will have the upper hand over all those who represent the employers of that country. Now, of course, there is hypocrisy with which the representative of the United States employers came up here in order to conceal his true attitude.

The second aspect of this concealment is all sorts of formal statements concerning the federal form of government. That federal form of government certainly does not prevent Conventions from being ratified on the abolition of forced labour. Paragraph 7 of article 19 of the I.L.O. Constitution provides for the ratification of Conventions by a federal State.

Last year, this Conference, bearing in mind States such as federal States which had still not done so, appealed to these States to ratify
the Forced Labour Convention, 1930. What has happened since? Only some three or four countries have ratified this Convention, and certain countries in which the Employers who have spoken from this rostrum have defended their interests is the work of the Ad Hoc Committee which had been set up previously with a very definite purpose—that of fostering enmity against the Soviet Union.

It was hoped thus to carry on the cold war against the Soviet Union, and such a negative approach failed both at this Conference and at last year's Conference. That is something which I can only welcome. Of course we had not the Employers' delegate of the United States taken it upon himself to defend those elements in his own country which are against the abolition of these various forms of labour unworthy of man and which still exist.

But that was not sufficient for him in order to conceal his true attitude, and so he used his strongest argument to conceal his hostile attitude towards this Convention, which is the customary and threadbare method of attacking the Soviet Union and the Socialist countries.

But I would say to the Employers that we, the representatives of Socialist countries, are not seeking their sympathy because socialism is the deadly enemy of capitalism which they represent and the interests of which they defend here against the interests of the working class.

But that is not what we should be speaking about here. You think that if you use strong words concerning the Iron Curtain, the Bamboo Curtin, and so on, that this brings more arguments to bolster up the hostile attitude taken up by you against the Convention on forced labour. Well, let us put all this aside. Are you going to ratify the Convention and comply with its provisions? That is the point, and on that basis, irrespective of the social or economic system, each delegate has the right to demand first of all an honest attitude towards the obligations contained therein.

If it is not your intention to ratify, then there is no point in speaking here as a sort of moral preacher. It recalls the type of preacher who preaches that others should have a piece of stale bread whereas he himself drinks good wine. Such preachers have no place in the International Labour Organisation. Everyone who comes here and makes demands on other countries should be prepared to fulfil the same things in his own country, and if he is against these standards being applied to his own country then he has absolutely no moral foundation to speak here as a preacher in favour of these standards.

Under the cloak of all these demagogic methods such as hypocritical preaching, appeals to God, references to federal forms of government, attacks against the Soviet Union, an attempt is made to hide the anti-labour substance and negative attitude to the standards that are being elaborated by the International Labour Organisation. But that must conscientiously and honestly perform our duty as Members of this Organisation and have at least a minimum of respect for each other. If you are unable to work on this general basis, then there is no place for you in this Organisation. This is an international Organisation which is based on the fact that each delegation represents a country which has certain obligations incumbent upon it.

The report of the Committee on Forced Labour and the work of the Conference in the course of these two years has shown that those who attempt to use this question of forced labour in order to increase tension against the Soviet Union and the Socialist countries fail.

Mr. ROTHMAN (Government advisor, United States)—First of all, I want to compliment the Chairman of the Committee on Forced Labour for the even-tempered way in which he conducted the affairs of the Committee, and to compliment the Reporter for his work. I would like also to call attention to the spirit of relative co-operation and harmony with which the Committee dispatched its business, a feeling that obviously has not carried over to this Conference in view of the last remarks of Mr. Arutiunian.

I would like to call to your attention what is apparent with respect to conditions in the United States—that labour and management are truly free to express their views without fear of retaliation by government. A true democracy is enlightened by ethical principles that put a curb upon governments in dealing with freedoms, and the objective of this declaration against forced labour is also to import a balance of decency into the relationship of governments to man which does not exist in certain countries that have practised inclusion considerably more scope by including more forms of forced labour which exist in the various countries.
is little need to retrace at this time the work of the ad hoc committees that have reported on the systems of forced labour which have been used for purposes of political coercion and for man’s exploitation in the fulfilment of state economic plans. And since yesterday, unfortunately, there must be added the United Nations report on Soviet intervention in Hungary. I wonder whether it might not be the release of that factual report that has elicited this smokescreen, this fog, this usual type of propaganda, to obscure the facts of an impartial body of the United Nations.

There have been some encouraging reports that in some places there was a certain relaxation of labour discipline, and I would like to say that, no matter how small, all of those changes for the better should be encouraged. But if there have been notes of encouragement, there have also been dispiriting reports of retrogression which, I regret to say, to my mind it has been the purpose of Mr. Arutiunian to obscure. These reports are not the product of propaganda or of emotional persons carried away by the drama of a “Black Sunday” in Budapest. These reports are not the uncorroborated views of partisans; these are the reports of competent, objective investigators based on inescapable evidence. These are the reports made public by the nations which do not yet have within their legal systems safeguards to bring an end to at least the gravest of human injustices. Nevertheless, we should not be too dispirited by those who claim that little can be gained—and in the light of this recent attack such beliefs might be strengthened—by a reformulation of these principles of fundamental human rights if they are not already available in the spirit and doctrine of a country. We should not be discouraged, in spite of the diatribes you have just heard; we should not be discouraged by these claims. These countries which do not yet have within their legal systems safeguards to bring an end to at least the gravest of human injustices. Nevertheless, we should not be too dispirited by those who claim that little can be gained—and in the light of this recent attack such beliefs might be strengthened—by a reformulation of these principles of fundamental human rights if they are not already available in the spirit and doctrine of a country.

The United States is prepared to vote for the Convention—because the United States strongly supports the objectives of the Convention and because existing constitutional and legislative action in the United States already gives effect to the provisions of the Convention. In a legal sense, therefore, the United States vote is merely expressive of conditions already existing in the United States. From a moral standpoint we desire, by our vote, to align ourselves with the extension throughout the world of the abolition of forced labour in accordance with what has long been the law and policy of the United States.

Under the United States constitutional system the document, however, is not suitable or appropriate for a treaty. In the light of the vote of this Conference this matter will be given further study by my Government.

For nearly one hundred years forced labour has been prohibited in the United States by constitutional amendment, which is the supreme law of the land, binding not only upon the federal Government but upon the states. The United States is unalterably opposed to forced labour and wholeheartedly supports the objectives of the I.L.O. Convention on this subject. The United States will voluntarily make reports as contemplated by the Convention.

I should like to call the attention of Mr. Arutiunian to something he knows but hypocritically does not recognize—that the I.L.O. Constitution contains a special provision with respect to federal States. Can it be that the smoke screen and the propaganda which you have just heard arise from the fact that there is an enlightened world opinion against the carrying away of people with intent to compel them to work against their will in remote and barren places? There is apprehension in the world over the mass employment of convict labour condemned with or without fair judicial trial to carry out the most difficult and life-endangering projects on a large scale. There is world sentiment against conscription of workers on a mass basis to carry out large industrial projects for which free labour can hardly be found, whether the masses are conscripted on the basis of alleged legal obligations or by other, compulsory means.

This document—and this is what bothers the previous speaker—will show that the world does not have a “don't care” attitude about man’s subordination to the political and economic planning goals of governments. The document has attempted to avoid the use of distorted or ambiguous words which might lend themselves to manipulation and enable those countries which want forced labour to say that they can have it. This bothers the previous speaker and in this regard the document is a stronger instrument than last year’s. I should like to call the attention of Mr. Arutiunian to something he knows but hypocritically does not recognize—that the I.L.O. Convention, which withhold from public disclosure, or do not disclose for long periods of time, laws and decrees which affect employment conditions. These countries practise forced labour of the kind condemned in this document before us. These laws and decrees apply to general conditions of employment, to labour discipline and to the conditions under which workers are committed to forced and corrective labour camps and colonies. The Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labour, which was authorised to look into forced labour conditions, found it necessary to point out the scarcity of reliable and up-to-date information on the legislation and practice concerning forced labour in these countries.
Under any system of government a fundamental guarantee of human dignity is the publicity that goes with making known to the workers and to the public laws and decrees affecting the workers. Any interested worker should be able to see and read any law or decree which applies to his situation or working conditions.

The eyes of the world have recently been opened to just such a situation by the United Nations report on Hungary. Deportees who huddled in trains crossing from Hungary asked a question which went unanswered: under what law were they deported? Under what legal authority were they taken from their homes and country? Enactments prepared in secret and withheld from public view, or upon their amendment, whether such enactment or change is made. by administrative or legislative bodies.

There is still another aspect of the non-publication of laws and decrees which seriously affects conditions of employment. The material evidence brought out by the Ad Hoc Committee shows that, whatever the rules of ordinary labour law may be, there are governments which in law and practice have also authorised administrative agencies to try under secret or vague laws persons of different political ideas, and to exile them to forced labour camps. Freedom of belief in such countries is beyond ordinary law. The whole system of labour law is precarious because of the intervention of the political arm of the government at any time. It is hoped that the situation is improving and that these secret procedures are no longer in force, although this recent attack leads me to believe that important leaders are being blunted. It would be most encouraging if it were true that things were improving, but how can the I.L.O. believe it to be true if the countries against whom such charges have been made do not publish the changes when they are made?

With this brief insight into the world of forced and compulsory labour camps and labour discipline, are there any hopes for the future if our performance is to avoid a sense of unreality, and, despite the type of propaganda pursued, should we indeed have some hopes for the future?

Firstly, the declaration against the use of systems of forced and conscript labour can do a number of things. It can influence thinking in the forced labour countries if it can be freely considered within those jurisdictions. It can be an appeal to improve conditions and at least it can serve as a cautionary warning against despotism. It can provide, by the fact of adoption here, an ideal for those systems which do not have within them scales of their own to measure man's human dignity.

Secondly, I had thought, based on the work of the Committee itself, that there was a reward not only in the finished document but also in the work that went into the making of it. I do not know whether I have to revise my view, but if we had all tried sincerely to make real the conviction that forced labour should end we would have made some progress. If we have done this and have not sought to manipulate simple words and plain meanings for the propaganda purposes of continuing forced labour, governments could find the key to translate this declaration into progress. That key is found in a spirit of moderation that can tolerate dissenting political and ideological views, and which does not follow an advantage to the bitter end of enslavement of individuals or peoples, as recent current events show. Where the spirit of moderation and tolerance can be nurtured from within there is hope that this declaration can do more than just be a hope.

I have been hopeful that there was some movement improvement because reports have emanated from some of the countries that practise forced labour to the effect that teachers and scholars are developing a "rule of law" consciousness. They are beginning to criticise, first cautiously and then more openly, which indicates that a sense of values and balances may be developing from within. I am sure that the kind of talk we recently heard is not conducive to type of spirit of inquiry, but I do hope that it will not be eliminated in those countries. I would like to say one thing in closing. Forced and compulsory labour with labour discipline does not come naturally to people. It is contrary to youth's intuitive feelings and conscience as it is to any reasonably prudent man. "The fathers have eaten wild grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." The hope and vision of the future is that forced and compulsory labour of whatever kind will ultimately be extinguished since, as recent events have shown, it can only succeed as long as force and subjugation are applied.

Mr. CRONIN (Workers' adviser, United States) — I had prepared a talk with regard to the Forced Labour Committee but before I go into that it would be remiss of me, I think, if I did not make some reply to the charges made by Mr. Arutiunian with regard to conditions in the United States as far as forced labour is concerned.

We in the United States do not practise forced labour in any way. There is no forced labour in the United States. I can only say that the information Mr. Arutiunian gets is not true and I would suggest that he get a new source of information because the one he has now does not give him information which is in accord with practices in our country. With reference to the ratification by the United States of the International Labour Convention No. 353, I had prepared a talk with regard to that ratification which is in accord with practices in our country. I am sure that the information Mr. Arutiunian gets is not true and I would suggest that he get a new source of information because the one he has now does not give him information which is in accord with practices in our country.

I do hope that it will not be eliminated in those countries. I would like to say one thing in closing. Forced and compulsory labour with labour discipline does not come naturally to people. It is contrary to youth's intuitive feelings and conscience as it is to any reasonably prudent man. "The fathers have eaten wild grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." The hope and vision of the future is that forced and compulsory labour of whatever kind will ultimately be extinguished since, as recent events have shown, it can only succeed as long as force and subjugation are applied.

Mr. CRONIN (Workers' adviser, United States) — I had prepared a talk with regard to the Forced Labour Committee but before I go into that it would be remiss of me, I think, if I did not make some reply to the charges made by Mr. Arutiunian with regard to conditions in the United States as far as forced labour is concerned.

We in the United States do not practise forced labour in any way. There is no forced labour in the United States. I can only say that the information Mr. Arutiunian gets is not true and I would suggest that he get a new source of information because the one he has now does not give him information which is in accord with practices in our country. With reference to the ratification by the United States of the International Labour Convention No. 353, I had prepared a talk with regard to that ratification which is in accord with practices in our country. I am sure that the information Mr. Arutiunian gets is not true and I would suggest that he get a new source of information because the one he has now does not give him information which is in accord with practices in our country.
done about it. The people of the world now look to this body, not for more argument, more debate and more study, but for action to lift this burden from the conscience of humanity.

The facts of the matter are as clear as they will ever be. The merits of the issue are as apparent as the distinction between night and day, black and white. They override the lawyer's technicality, the politician's expediency, the cynic's indifference or the fool's illusion. They cry out for action. It is, of course, true that the powers of this Conference to deal effectively with the problem are limited and largely depend upon moral force and the good faith of nations, but so long as the limits of that power have yet to be reached there can be no excuse for stopping short or settling for anything less than the most forceful expression of our will that is available to us. If such questions as hours of work, employment offices and social security are regarded as appropriate for action in the form of a Convention, can the question of freedom versus compulsion be treated as less fundamental to the welfare of labour and therefore justifying a less positive form of action or no action at all? No condition is a more flagrant contradiction or a more outrageous mockery of every principle espoused by the International Labour Organisation than the condition of forced labour. To allow this condition to continue would amount to consent and to the acceptance by this body of a share of the burden of guilt for the perpetuation of that condition. Any course short of the strongest possible condemnation of forced labour would betray not only the victims of compulsory servitude but the ideals, the principles and the integrity of this Organisation. I am confident that this Conference will meet this challenge and honour its responsibilities.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. CALDEÑONPUIG (Government delegate, Mexico) — I had not intended to take part in this discussion. I did not expect to do so because I think that the subject has been thoroughly discussed. The debates last year and this year together have been quite sufficient. It is a subject to which the Conference considers that the greatest importance should be attached since it affects the very roots of human rights. The interest of the Conference is evident from the large number of persons present in order that we may vote, unanimously, I hope, on this proposed Convention. It is only a few weeks ago since the Chairman of the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations referred to the International Labour Organisation for its efforts to eliminate forced labour throughout the world. I think we are all in agreement on this elimination and that the reservations made by some delegates on specific aspects of the proposed Convention are not fundamental; I repeat that we could adopt the present Convention unanimously. I do not wish, therefore, to go into unnecessary further arguments here, but I have come to the platform to refer to an allusion made by one of my eminent predecessors on this platform regarding Mexican workers who go to find work in the United States. Two years ago, at the 1955 Session of the Conference, a similar allusion was made and I think I may refer to what I said then as the situation has not changed and I can use similar terms now. Then thanked the speaker who had just spoken for his interest in the lot of the Mexican workers in question, because it was my conviction that this interest must be quite sincere. However, I also thought it opportune to inform the Conference, so that there should be no doubt, that the Mexican Government sufficiently protects the interests of Mexican citizens. It establishes bilateral agreements with the United States Government regulating the migration of Mexican workers to the great democracy to the north. Finally, I can assure you once more that if in Mexico we believed our citizens were going to work under forced labour conditions the Government of Mexico would not allow a single one of its sons to leave our territory in order to work in such circumstances. The position of the Mexican agricultural workers is not perfect, and public opinion in my country would like to secure some improvement. But we are certain of the good faith of the United States Government in regard to these bilateral negotiations and we therefore believe that this problem does not need to occupy the attention of the Conference.

I am sorry to have had to speak about it at all, but if I had been silent I might have appeared to be associating the Mexican Government with what had been said by the previous speaker, and that would be admitting a charge that it had neglected the protection of its citizens, which is certainly not the case.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. SLIP-Chenko (Government delegate, Ukraine) — The Government delegation of the Ukrainian S.S.R. accepts the proposed Convention on the abolition of forced labour in the form in which it is submitted by the Committee, although with mixed feelings. On the one hand we are prepared to support it; on the other hand we continue to feel that it is still needs improvement. Of course the exclusion of subparagraph (f) has weakened the Convention, and unfortunately, this draft no longer provides for the abolition of all forms of forced labour. The reluctance to give the Convention comprehensive scope can only signify one thing: the attempt of certain circles to weaken the effectiveness of this Convention.

We have heard here voices speaking about the higher principles of democracy, the defence of human rights, and so on, but is it possible to speak of giving effect to the principles of democracy and human rights while keeping silent about the concrete forms of violation of these principles and rights, and narrowing down the whole concept of forced labour?

Mr. Parker and Mr. Rothman, you live in a so-called free world; but what can be the meaning of your freedom, your honesty, your fairness, about which you have so extensively spoken here? Listening to your statements I remembered that our great Ukrainian democrat-poet Taras Shevchenko in his time wrote with sarcasm about the freedom under which everyone is free to eat out of a golden dish, and also how that great Frenchman, Anatole France, mocked that equality under which the law prohibits both the millionaire and the
beggar from sleeping under the bridges. Is it in defense of such freedom as this that you are preaching from the rostrum of the International Labour Conference? Can you gentlemen, speaking of liberty, equality, and so on, choose your lives to the tyranny of commerce in your own country, among others, as a result of measures aimed at the prohibition or restriction of strikes? Do not the workers in your country, gentlemen—you who are the so-called defenders of liberty—suffer a considerable violation of their rights as a result of the discrimination which still exists in the field of employment? Is forced labour as a result of discriminatory measures in connection with payment for work and racial conditions a thing of the past? Is it not justified that millions of workers in the United States should have appealed against the situations they have to suffer on account of peonage or debt bondage?

No, gentlemen, all these and similar forms of forced labour have not vanished into the past. The struggle against forced labour in all its forms is flaring up here and there, burning with the flame of the struggle for freedom against colonial oppression, not only in the United States or in the home countries of the large colonial powers but also in colonies and the non-metropolitan territories.

Let us remember how at the 39th Session of the Conference and in the Governing Body many delegations justly criticised the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labour for its lack of objectivity, for its tendentious distortion of the facts. The authors of that report and others, who adopted the vicious method of searching for forced labour where it does not exist at all and not seeing it where it really does, ignored the views of many delegates both at this session and the former session who conclusively showed that forced labour truly does exist. Many delegates at both sessions showed clearly what their attitude was, since they voted in favour of a Convention which, although not perfect, is still a more or less satisfactory basis for the elaboration of a final text for this important international instrument. The method of searching for forced labour in the United States Employers is very typical, as well as that of certain others who follow in their wake and who represent other countries. I refer to the attitude also in the Committee when the introduction of language defining the various forms of forced labour was being discussed. If we were to examine what their efforts are directed at we would see that they were aimed, first of all, at ensuring that such a Convention should not come into being or, if that failed, at weakening it by eliminating from the Convention the mention of all the forms of forced labour and the defenses thus made to turn this important international document—which is what a Convention on forced labour should be—into a mere formality.

In the United States, Mr. Parker, debt bondage is widely used as a measure of forced labour and I think that the American employers do not really want a document that in any way would restrict their freedom to exploit. That, of course, is fully understandable, if we look at the oppressed state in which millions of workers find themselves in that great capitalist country, and if we point to the racial discrimination to which hundreds of thousands of Negroes are still subjected and to the anti-trade union laws which still exist in the United States.

I must say straight out that especially in the post-war years these millions have acquired tremendous experience. They have been able to see who is their friend and who is their enemy. They have learned the true worth of freedom, for they have brought considerable sacrifices to the altar of freedom, even in the United States. They have deserved a genuine and not a mere paper right to freedom.

Of course it is impossible to demand that in the conditions of a capitalistic society free labour should be developed to such an extent and secure such safeguards as in the undoubtedly more progressive Socialist society, but that does not exclude the possibility, indeed the need, for us here jointly to undertake an attempt to achieve progress in this field and to ensure that the Convention that we are here discussing should not remain a dead letter.

The manoeuvres we have witnessed to satisify, and which have been used by certain delegates whenever anything unpleasant crops up (I am referring in particular to the Employers' delegates of the United States), is immediately to drag up the Hungarian question; I am afraid this has become the standard operating procedure for the delegation of that country.

Mr. Bothman, I have listened to your statement with interest. Do you know what I am going to say to you? It is that I would be glad to hear your speech in favour of this Convention when it comes up in the United States Senate. But I doubt whether you will defend this Convention with the same warmth in your Senate as you have been doing here. As for the Government delegation of the Ukrainian S.S.R., we will submit this Convention for ratification, and it is with a clear conscience that we will vote in its favour here.

Mr. YÜ (Government delegate, China)—The topic contained in the report under discussion is of profound importance and far-reaching consequences. It touches on certain fundamentals which form the corner-stone of the International Labour Organisation and involves the supreme question of right and wrong. For this reason, every faithful Member of our Organisation must needs give the matter his most earnest attention.

On behalf of my delegation I deem it a privilege to state frankly to you the views of my Government in support of the proposed resolutions and Convention at this Conference, because we believe that they are forward steps and effective weapons to combat this great social, economic and political evil known as forced labour.

In the Charter of the United Nations, we find that one of the high purposes and principles is "to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." It stands to reason that the Members of the International Labour
Organisation, as well as Members of all other international organisations, should co-operate in solving such a problem. In connection with this problem of forced labour, certain countries, through words and deeds, through laws and regulations and, at times, through sheer lawlessness, have been running counter to the respect of the fundamental human rights and of the dignity and worth of the human person. The International Labour Organisation should be congratulated on the attention that it has heretofore accorded to this question.

Before going into the facts and figures concerning the problem, may I make a few observations concerning the philosophy underlying it. In the earliest times and in general, forced labour did not exist in the present form, since if there was any compulsion at all it would have come from within, instead of from without. Primitive peoples used to fish and hunt not because they were forced by outside human pressure but rather because they were driven by the sheer instinct for self-preservation. They worked assiduously, but they did it of their own free will. As time marched on, those who had the power to do so would at times compel others to work for them without adequate compensation for the work done. That was the origin of forced labour. On the other hand, history tells us that early civilisations of certain countries occasionally did advance so much as to give ample freedom to the individuals to work, even without the workers' knowing that they were being given the freedom of the free type of human labour. For instance, over some 40 centuries ago there existed in my country a farmer's song which ran as follows: "When the sun rises I begin to work; when the sun sets I begin to retire; what is to me the benevolence of the Emperor?" That song exemplifies and testifies to the full freedom of an ancient Chinese farmer as a human individual, working with dignity and without pressure of any kind from governmental authorities.

The sentiment of that Chinese farmer should be the sentiment of every workman of the twentieth century if civilisation had truly and sufficiently marched onwards. Has it? It pains me to say that on the mainland of my country the song of that happy farmer is no longer heard, and forced labour has been one of the basic policies of the Peiping puppet régime from the very beginning. When that régime was organised in the fall of 1949, it chose to adopt a basic document known as the "Common Programme". This was and still is the declaration of the basic policies of the Communist dictatorship on my country's mainland. Article 7 of the so-called Common Programme provides: "Regarding the reactionary elements, feudalist landlords and bureaucraticreactionaries we will deprive them of their military weapons and eliminated their special influence we still have to deprive them of their political rights whenever necessary in accordance with the law, but at the same time we have to provide them with means of living, compel them to redeem themselves by labour and change them into new men. If they continue to pursue revolutionary activities, severe measures must then be taken." This is the basic policy of the Communist régime of my country's mainland. It is called "reform by labour". It is a frank and blunt admission that labour is being employed as a means of political coercion against those holding or expressing certain political views. It is clear that this policy is one of punishment for a previous social or political status, and certain people are punished not because they have violated the law but because they happen to be in certain stations to which the Communists are hostile.

The declaration of policy in the Common Programme employs the expression "in accordance with the law". The law in question is the "Statute on the Punishment of Counter-Revolutionaries in the Chinese People's Republic". According to this Statute, so-called counter-revolutionary elements include "bandits, rascals, secret agents, reactionary parties or groups and reactionary associations or clans". The arbitrary definition of these elements is such that even the Communists do not find it possible to punish them all. At a session of the National Political Consultative Conference, the Communist so-called Premier of China, Chou En-lai, once reported: "In compliance with the directive of Chairman Mao [Tse-tung] in deciding the penalties, we have decided that to those who have 'blood debts' or those counter-revolutionary elements who have inflicted serious damages to national interests, we must hand down the death sentence and have them executed. To those who deserve the death sentence but who have no 'blood debts' or who have inflicted less serious damages to national interests, we will hand down the death sentence but would have their execution deferred for a period of two years, during which they would do forced labour on probation."

It goes without saying that forced labour in Communist China is really on the one hand a form of arbitrary punishment of the political enemies of the Communist régime, and on the other hand a means to obtain labour for the Communist régime without adequate compensation. To compel people to fall in line, they are sentenced to death first and can be executed at any time their masters may choose. Terror, therefore, is employed as an instrument of political and economic policy. It is an extremely cruel and gruesome spectacle in the world of today.

Regarding this matter, the Communist régime at Peiping is not trying to hide the brutal facts from the outside world. On the contrary, forced labour has been "proclaimed a national policy" and its implementation throughout the land is fully reported in the Communist-controlled press. In fact, it is trumpeted with pride as one of the major achievements of the régime and as a clever and imaginative undertaking which at once suppresses its political enemies and increases production.

Because of the great importance of this question from the humanitarian viewpoint as well as from the viewpoint of world security, my delegation feels that the International Labour Organisation is in duty bound to take effective measures in order to combat this social and political injustice known as forced labour. Without going into further details, may I add that there is a more serious consideration
involved; the question of forced labour is not merely a question of forced labour per se, it is a question of wider importance. It is not a question divided by race, religion or sex, it is a question divided between right and wrong and between justice and injustice.

With these brief observations, I repeat once and for all that my country attaches tremendous importance to this question of forced labour not because it involves human rights alone but also because it involves the security of the Far East and therefore the security of the whole world. My delegation considers that the proposed Convention and resolutions contained in the report of the Committee on Forced Labour represent certain forward steps and we shall support and vote for them.

Interpretation from Spanish: Mr. Funes (Government delegate, El Salvador)—The delegation of El Salvador had decided, in view of the report of the Committee on Forced Labour, to support fully the proposed Convention. We had not intended to take part in the discussion and I shall be very brief now.

I have to speak because of the reference made by a previous speaker in favour of limitations on the right of discussion of delegates on the grounds that the States from which they come have or have not ratified certain Conventions. On this point, as representative of my country, which has ratified very few Conventions, I believe it proper to make this statement. For us the important thing is loyalty to the principles of the I.L.O. and the Conventions and Recommendations it produces. For the workers of the world, who are those who really know whether the principles are applied or not, the argument of formal ratification or non-ratification is of particularly little weight.

For us, what matters is that the decisions of the I.L.O. shall be carried out. This rostrum produces. For the workers of the world, who are those who really know whether the principles are applied or not, the argument of formal ratification or non-ratification is of particularly little weight. When we know that a State has flagrantly violated the very principles on which Conventions are based.

Interpretation from Russian: Mr. Surguchev (Employers' delegate, U.S.S.R.)—It had not been my intention to speak now, but Mr. Rothman's statement has prompted me to come up to the rostrum. In his statement Mr. Rothman referred to questions which, in substance, are entirely unknown to him and with which he is not familiar, not as far as our country is concerned, anyway. He said that we have various forms of forced labour. He said that thousands of people are put on to construction work and reclamation of land and so on. Well, he is not familiar with the Soviet man and he sees man merely as a source of profit. He does not see the essential qualities inherent in the Soviet man.

Mr. Rothman forgets that 40 years ago when the first shot was fired from the Aurora the whole personality of the Russian people was changed. Our men, at that time half shod, half clothed and with only one rifle between several, struggled for liberty and now it is these men and their descendants who are impelled, not by forced labour but by sheer enthusiasm, to go on to new, untrodden, virgin soil and create that agriculture and that work which is necessary to our country.

I, in order to speak about the Soviet man you have to be familiar with him and to know him much better than is the ease with Mr. Rothman and many others who have spoken here. Facts are plain facts and it is a fact that in the great patriotic war our men gave their lives and paved with their bodies the path over which others advanced. All that could be done only by people prompted by really ardent feelings for their country.

There is one last point upon which I wish to dwell and I must admit I am speaking under the stress of emotion. I would like to speak about what Mr. Rothman called the events in Hungary. I must say that I personally hate fascism. Fascism means the tears of mothers in my country, the destruction of factories, of towns, of villages. It means an ocean of tears which in our country were shed by mothers and children in the years of war, and the resurrection of this fascism or anything like it will never be admitted by my country. I think perhaps I am right in saying that Mr. Rothman must have been in Auschwitz and Buchenwald as a tourist inspecting concentration camps; I must tell you that I have been in a concentration camp too, but not as a tourist. I know what it means to be in a concentration camp and that is why we will not permit the return of fascism or the return of concentration camps.

Mr. Mukherjee (Workers' adviser, India)—At the outset I must congratulate the Chairman of the Committee on Forced Labour and the staff engaged thereon for the submission of this report, which is an almost unanimous one. The proposed text is an historic one in the matter of the achievement of social justice all over the world. I am glad to note that the Employers and the Government of India have agreed to lend their support to this text, and I believe the Government of India will consequently ratify this Convention.

I beg to draw attention to a particular sentence in paragraph 14 of the report, which states, inter alia: "The workers agreed even that in certain circumstances penalties could be imposed for participation in illegal strikes and that these penalties might include normal prison labour." I am afraid this sentence may confuse the issue while implementing the text of the Convention in the countries concerned. It is really a lacuna and a loophole which may be interpreted by reluctant parties in favour of using forced labour. To strike is the fundamental right of the working class and it is sacred, too, particularly for the countries which are democratic and free. Any sentence based on the meaning of interference in strikes should in all circumstances be avoided; therefore this particular sentence, though it is included with honest intentions, will, I suspect, bring in some difficulties as regards implementation.

I also request that there be set up a committee on behalf of the Governing Body or that there be if possible a continuation of this Ad Hoc Committee which has made such a splendid report on this question of forced
labour. Facts have been revealed which were unknown to the eastern part of the world, particularly Asian countries, and which have brought much light to the question to the advantage of the free trade unions. I would therefore suggest that an effective aid to implementation of this spectacular instrument would be the continuance of such a committee, which would report to the Governing Body from time to time, supervise conditions in the countries which have ratified it and supervise also the conditions of the people in those countries which are unwilling to ratify. Matters have become somewhat confused in the allegations and counter-allegations made from different sides, but I feel that if an independent committee is set up by the I.L.O. in the matter of the implementation of this particular text it will be very helpful to the trade unions, to the States and to the people of the world as a whole.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. JODOIN)—I now declare the general discussion closed and if there are no objections we will consider the report as adopted.

(The report is adopted.)

PROPOSED CONVENTION CONCERNING THE ABOLITION OF FORCED LABOUR:

Discussion and Adoption

The PRESIDENT (Mr. JODOIN)—Now I propose to proceed to the adoption of the proposed Convention clause by clause, and I would suggest considering the whole of the preamble as one clause. Are there any observations on the preamble?

Mr. PARKER (Employers' delegate, United States)—I had stated that I intended to abstain on this instrument. At that time I had the impression that there would be a record vote. I have no desire to hold up the proceedings of this Conference and I have no objection to the wording of the preamble, except that it refers to the Convention. I ask whether it is possible that my abstention be noted in order that it will not be necessary for me to abstain on each one of the Articles.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. JODOIN)—Your abstention will be recorded. If there are no further observations, I declare the preamble adopted.

(The preamble is adopted.)

(Articles 1 and 2 are adopted seriatim.)

The PRESIDENT (Mr. JODOIN)—If there is no objection, I declare the Convention as a whole adopted.

(The Convention as a whole is adopted.)

The PRESIDENT (Mr. JODOIN)—The Convention will be referred to the Drafting Committee of the Conference.

As regards consideration of the resolutions appended to the report of the Committee on Forced Labour, this will be deferred until the final vote on the Convention has been taken.

I wish now to express sincere thanks to the Chairman, Mr. Saxer, as well as to the Reporter, Mr. Oknes, for a job well done.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL: DISCUSSION (cont.)

Interpretation from French: Mr. MINJOZ (Secretary of State for Labour and Social Security, France)—The Director-General's Report before the present session of the Conference deals chiefly with the social repercussions of automation and other technical developments. Though it is most useful that the International Labour Conference should discuss this year a problem which has the attention of all those who are concerned with labour problems in the big industrial countries, it is no less striking to find that beyond the preoccupations of today this problem is in fact only one of the aspects of the economic and social change which characterises the whole of our epoch.

By stressing each year a problem of present importance—rural and urban conditions, manpower, economic development, productivity, automation—the Director-General is in fact dealing only with one and the same problem, that of the necessary adaptation of social policy and law to the technical changes which occur, the adaptation of ideas themselves to economic development.

French policy in the social field, as the process of evolution enables it to be stated year by year, can only confirm the wisdom of the analysis made in the Director-General's Report. Whether one is dealing with progress made in long-term economic forecasting or with the efforts made in the field of regional programmes extending over five years, appearance too narrow to permit a satisfactory determination of a real employment policy. At the geographical level also, the development of regional studies, a better knowledge of problems concerning underdeveloped countries, the development of overseas territories and, above all, a more thorough study of the conditions surrounding European economic integration give wider objectives to social policy. Year by year, therefore, against a very wide background it is appropriate to consider the

1 See Appendix VII, p. 771.
elements of policies on the employment and labour conditions and the aspects of economic policy which deal with the influence of technical progress on the employment of the labour force.

One of the major difficulties in the way of a better knowledge of economic and social problems is that of finding an acceptable mean between economic theory, which is too abstract, and current opinions, which are too confused and deal with imprecise notions.

We may be grateful to the I.L.O. for having contributed by its clear studies to bringing order into our thinking regarding the social effects of automation and the use of atomic power. The prospects of development in the technical field, particularly through automation, are indeed extremely difficult to appraise. The Director-General's Report quite rightly insists on the complexity of the notion of automation. The rise of automation appears as a kind of technical progress which may greatly modify labour productivity and therefore have important consequences on the employment of the labour force. It may even lead to a reduction in hours of work which would enable employed persons to profit more from the increase in production.

But what justifies the interest accorded to the economic and social evaluation of these new techniques is the fact that in the future their operation will probably occur at a speed and on a scale which will be out of all proportion to past technical advances.

However, under the term "automation" one often groups various forms of technical progress, ranging from simple mechanisation to quite new and complex techniques of automatic regulation and control. Within the framework of these two types of transformation—mechanisation and automation—the possibilities and consequences are widely different, according as they relate to handling operations, or to elementary manufacture operations, or to mass production operations. Depending on the nature of the industry, the passage from one stage to another may be retarded or even precluded by the diversity of goods produced, the seasonal character of production or the irregularity of supplies. The practical application of some inventions in the field of automation may also be held up by inadequate facilities for making the necessary equipment, or by the restricted market open to the national industry. This is why, if one leaves aside some industries which provide familiar examples of automation, it is difficult to appreciate the consequences which automation might have as regards manpower.

In terms of present economic programmes—for instance, the third French modernisation plan—the consequences of automation do not appear very considerable; but unforeseen rapid developments may occur, and it is essential to look ahead now to the long-term consequences which may be produced.

Changes in skills must particularly involve conclusions regarding technical education and vocational training, to which immediate regard must be had. It is therefore indispensable to introduce facilities for speedy retraining.

Observations of the same kind may be made regarding the use of nuclear power. In the long run an increase in the availability of power will necessarily have important economic and social consequences. In particular problems regarding regional imbalance and underdevelopment will be placed in a new light. But, at a more immediate level, atomic research and the operation of programmes for the development of nuclear power require highly skilled labour at a time when there is a general shortage of engineers, technicians and skilled workers.

To the extent to which the social effects of automation and the use of nuclear power in the coming decades can be known, the chief conclusion to be drawn is the need for development of employment forecasting. In my own country, France, in recent years the circles concerned have realised the fundamental importance of economic forecasting and the need for its extension to manpower. Within the framework of the second modernisation plan, 1954-57, and for the preparation of the third plan, which is to run from 1957 to 1961, considerable progress in forecasting regarding employment and manpower has been achieved thanks to the improvement of the basic documentation provided by the census and demographic forecasts. Long-term study of employment prospects, though still difficult, is in constant progress. The drawing up of a vocational training and technical education programme requires precise forecasts on the development of the economy and of employment in the various trades and occupations, for eight or ten years ahead. Thus the employment policy must now be handled at a level above the traditional level of manpower services, and all the problems—those of young persons, vocational training, the school leaving age, women's work, hours of work, immigration—must be reconsidered against a long-term background.

Furthermore, employment forecasting is developing in France thanks to the operation of programmes of regional action. It has been recognised that the national economic plan cannot be sufficiently adjusted to regional disequilibrium which, in the field of manpower in particular, results from the demographic situation, the rural exodus and the transport situation. Regional programmes make it possible to determine the limit within which the geographic mobility of manpower should be favoured, the zones and industries for which it is preferable to provide for an expansion in the years to come. Thus the full employment policy is due to undergo very considerable changes. Without neglecting the overall and, especially, the economic aspects, it must above all today introduce adjustment mechanisms imposing actions taking effect immediately which will show their value in the light of long-term forecasts.

It is important above all to face the evolution of skills due to technical progress. It has become a commonplace to observe that the economy will need more and more technicians and engineers, more skilled workers and less labourers. But the question is more complex than that. According to the degree of mechanisation or automation, the need for skilled manpower will be different from one economic branch to another and, furthermore, the skills required will themselves be transformed. It is therefore indispensable to introduce facilities for speedy retraining.
and to ensure that the workers will suffer no prejudice because of their retraining or redeployment.

France has established for this purpose a manpower redeployment fund, which has been operating for the last two years. Subsidies have been given to undertakings and vocational training centres which provide retraining courses for workers whose employment has been affected by technical developments and changes in the economic market. To this must be added the action of the European Coal and Steel Community, in the sectors within its competence. The Treaty establishing the European Economic Community also makes provision for similar machinery.

Furthermore, parallel with the traditional aspect of labour promotion, executive development schemes organised by various bodies such as productivity centres and occupational or inter-occupational training bodies are on the increase. Sessions for study and training for the new techniques are organised for heads of undertakings, supervisors and technicians, and are being extended more and more to skilled workers.

At a different level, the better utilisation of available manpower is to be promoted by a Bill now before Parliament, relating to the employment and rehabilitation of handicapped workers. The Bill is not restricted to giving these unfortunate people employment priority. It also lays down conditions for retraining, re-education and vocational training.

But it is essentially towards the training of young persons that the manpower adjustment drive must be first of all directed. Although it is not possible to analyse the elements in the educational reform which the French authorities are now striving to put into effect, it is important to stress that the development of vocational guidance, technical education and, in general, all forms of technical training, is fundamental in meeting the present and future shortage of technicians, engineers and skilled workers. On the other hand, the difficulty of knowing precisely what will be the future need for manpower in the various trades, the constant alteration in the skills required, the need to encourage some occupational and geographical mobility, must induce us to give technical education the character of a basic training and broad educational background which may serve as a starting point for constant adjustment of the individual to his employment during his working life.

Adult vocational training, provided in France by centres under the Ministry of Labour, is one means of securing better adjustment of manpower skills to the new employment conditions which arise out of technical and economic development. It constitutes also for unskilled workers a means of securing additional vocational training and is hence a valuable means of upgrading the working class.

Action in the field of conditions of work must also be taken within the framework of an over-all economic policy. Social policy cannot consist merely in adapting remuneration to the various welfare benefits to the economic conditions of the moment. On the contrary, it must give the worker certain safeguards within the framework of an economic progression over a long period. Indeed, it is inconceivable that economic expansion, particularly if co-ordinated by planning, should not go hand in hand with a policy to give the workers wage and employment protection in all the circumstances which may follow from the occupational and geographical mobility of manpower.

But such an objective is not enough. We must seek for a real transformation of the status of the wage earner. This transformation may be obtained by improving standards of life, particularly through the wages and fringe benefits policy and by a reduction in hours of work. But it is above all the essential standing of the employed person which can and should be improved.

In the field of wages policy, it is for the government to determine a guaranteed national minimum wage for all occupations—which we call the S.M.N.I.G.—which will remain an important element in economic and social policy. At the beginning of last year, the wage zones, the differences in wages between one zone and another, were reduced with a view to their progressive abolition.

As regards collective agreements, certain tendencies in the wage field are beginning to develop. Several examples may be quoted of works or company agreements establishing a form of guaranteed annual or monthly wage. Supplemental pensions schemes, already in force for supervisors, are more and more frequent now for salaried employees and wage earners, and recently a national collective agreement has provided for the organisation and administration of these schemes.

Various government Bills now before Parliament tend to determine more precisely certain methods of determining conditions of work. One of these Bills aims at completing and expanding the scope of the conciliation and mediation procedures in collective industrial disputes. The efficiency of the conciliation boards in operation for the last seven years would be more complete if we made the appearance of all the parties before these bodies compulsory. The mediation procedure established in 1955 has given very satisfactory results regarding wage disputes. The Bill proposes to strengthen the investigative powers of mediators regarding the economic position of undertakings and to extend this procedure to all collective disputes, even if they do not deal with wages. It also provides for a conciliation procedure to settle disputes in public undertakings.

Other new provisions which have already been adopted or proposed by the French Government have a wider scope, for they relate to the essential status of the employed person. Last year, a big improvement was made with regard to leisure. Normal annual holidays with pay were increased from two to three weeks for all wage earners in all occupations. This increase in holidays is, in the eyes of the workers, one of the most lasting changes in their conditions of life. It represents a further step in the social development started in 1936 by the establishment of holidays with pay.

Another Bill now being discussed tends to fix in a uniform manner the notice to be given in case of dismissal on the emplo
The period would be increased to a month. This measure, if adopted, will give workers threatened with dismissal considerably more protection than is at present the case. It will eliminate one of the most important elements in employment insecurity and will bring the conditions of wage earners closer to those of salaried employees.

In another field a Bill now under examination is designed to establish leave without pay for workers wishing to take part in training courses or workers’ education courses or trade union training courses. Such a measure may have very wide effects. It will enable workers’ educational bodies to develop. They are now hampered by the need for organising their courses during annual holidays or on Sundays and public holidays. It will favour the adjustment of trade union leaders and leading workers to the new economic and social conditions, and will thus be one of the factors for a better integration of employed persons in their employment milieu.

The French Government also proposes to improve the condition of homeworkers. As regards this group of persons—and as I said only yesterday in the Upper House of our Parliament—the thing is to combine effective protection of the worker with the economic usefulness of this type of labour in non-industrialised regions or as regards seasonal activities. Home work must be protected, but economic considerations must not stand in the way of putting an end to irregular practices which are to the detriment of the workers themselves and to the development of the trades in which they are engaged. Therefore, the Government has placed before Parliament a Bill regarding the position of homeworkers. These persons will benefit by all the laws and regulations applicable to other workers, particularly as regards holidays, wages and hours of work. Their legal position will be made clearer and the means of securing observance of the provisions regarding them will be strengthened.

Finally, it is impossible to neglect a new and wider aspect of conditions of work problems. It is necessary nowadays to study them at the international level. The Treaty signed in Rome on 25 March 1957 by Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and France providing for the establishment of a European Economic Community includes important provisions on social matters. The development of studies on international disparities in social legislation and their economic effects, and, in particular, the remarkable work of the I.L.O. on the social aspects of European economic co-operation and on hours of work have provided valuable elements of knowledge of this problem and have enabled a policy of harmonising social legislation to be defined in a more precise way.

It has therefore become apparent that a necessary step in support to the establishment of a common European market and the free movement of workers must be a reconciliation of national laws and particularly the achievement of equality of payment between male and female workers, maintenance of equivalence regarding holidays with pay, and the adoption of common principles for the payment of overtime.

Before concluding, I should like, without departing from the objective and courteous tone of our discussion, to refer to the remarks made by the representative of the W.F.T.U. on Algeria. It is easy to call for the re-establishment of normal trade union rights in Algeria by referring without any precise facts to alleged violation of these rights. But while pointing out that the French Government has explained its position fully and given all necessary information on the labour and trade union situation in Algeria, I should like to add that those who hope their protests to have any real value should also call for freedom for the workers of countries like Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and condemn the government which sent troops to Hungary to crush the courageous revolution of that country.

Having said this—and I apologise for being rather long—I would like to stress that the analysis of the policy now followed by France regarding labour matters leads to an essential conclusion. French experience is certainly very far from being unique, for other Westerners have found similar solutions. But although, when the time comes, economic changes may occur in such a way that the necessary adjustments can be made without trouble, it is none the less certain that the fears expressed today by the workers on the consequences of technical developments are partly justified by the vagueness of our outlook on the future.

This is why social policy must consist, above all, in improving our means of understanding the situation, in introducing adjustment mechanisms and in guaranteeing a social condition of the workers such that the security they have obtained cannot be challenged, as unfortunately was done too often in the industrial revolution owing to the insufficient level of labour protection.

In these various fields of social policy, it is certain that in some cases France has blazed new trails in research and adopted pioneering solutions. In other fields the experience of foreign countries and the information digests of the big international agencies, like the I.L.O., provide us with extremely valuable data. But we cannot blink the fact that, owing to the rapid pace of technical progress and of economic and social evolution, solutions must be found and applied more swiftly and an exchange of experience at the international level is more and more necessary.

Indeed, we are today witnessing such an upsurge in international economic co-operation that international social questions can no longer be approached in a context of study, research and statements of principle alone.
No, effective solutions must be found. We think that the action taken by the European institutions is a step in this direction. Thus, in all aspects of social policy we see the truth of this remark made by the Director-General at the beginning of his Report when he says: "This, indeed, is our special problem and our special responsibility: to adjust our thinking."

Interpretation from French: Mr. AGO (Government delegate, Italy)—It has now become a tradition that the Director-General's Report should every year draw our attention to an essential problem of economic and social development.

The Report which we are discussing at this 40th Session of the International Labour Conference touches on one of the questions which we all agree in considering as one of the most essential of our times. More than a report, it is really a detailed study, rich in well-documented and extremely interesting information on the present situation in many countries; it also contains well-balanced, wise and practical observations and suggestions. So that once more we owe the Director-General and his staff a debt of gratitude.

The Report concludes, as you will have seen, with an attempt to find guiding principles. It is on some of those guiding principles and some of the considerations they call forth, particularly from the point of view of my country's position, that I would like to talk to you briefly now.

Automation, this new—and perhaps not very elegant—term, is an expression which seems to have a sort of mysterious and menacing connotation, and yet there is nothing threatening or mysterious in the phenomenon itself. What we understand by automation is only, in the last resort, a chapter of technological progress.

I will therefore refrain from the temptation of defining the term "automation" and from taking a stand on the vexed question of whether it is a revolution or an evolution.

Technological progress is not in itself anything new, as the Director-General's Report so well points out. What there may be new in it is its speed, because technical progress which in the past evolved at the imperceptible pace of millennia and centuries now seems to be progressing by yearly bounds. It is for this reason that the technological transformations which it brings with it may produce disturbances in the life of society and that a crisis may be produced if changes in the economic and social structures are not carried out with sufficient promptitude, so as not to let these structures lag behind technological evolution.

This problem comes up with particular intensity at the moment because of the fact that the pace of technological progress has become, after new discoveries and new conquests of scientific thought, disconcertingly rapid nowadays. We are witnessing an evolution which we can say is proceeding at the rate of a geometrical progression. It is not by chance that society finds itself in an extremely difficult position. But it is also indispensable that the effect of progress and in particular of automation on social life should be carefully foreseen so as to prevent the temporary crises which its development may produce. It would be a terrible result if the endeavours made with a view to seeking out new means which should enable man to live better were to engender suffering, even if such suffering were limited in time and affected only a single generation.

What we have to do therefore is to get economic and social evolution into step with technological progress and above all be able to forestall the possible implications of the application of new methods and new processes so as not only to avoid their unfortunate consequences but to increase their benefits.

The problem has not the same features in the different countries. Where industrial development is already high in countries where large-scale industry is dominant, technological progress and automation fit in readily and with few preoccupying implications. In the same way, in the countries which are very little industrialised, the absence of old structures may be one obstacle the less to the adoption of new and advanced systems. On the other hand, in countries such as mine, for instance, where there is a preponderance of
small and medium-sized industries, less well equipped to meet the considerable efforts required by the introduction of new techniques, difficulties may be much more serious. Where large capital is readily available the cost of automation is easy to meet, whereas in countries which do not have the necessary capital, where the money rate is high, there is a considerable obstacle to be foreseen. Again, in countries which have achieved full employment or where there is a manpower shortage, automation possibly represents an instrument which may ease present difficulties. On the other hand, in regions where there is a surplus of population and manpower, the introduction of automation may represent, at least for a transitional period, a cause of increased unemployment, and this is no doubt one of the most serious preoccupations which should be borne in mind.

Finally, where systems of education and vocational training are better adapted to make it possible for manpower to be transferred rapidly from certain industries to others, from certain methods of work to different methods, the consequences of the introduction of automatic systems will be rapidly overcome, whereas where the contrary situation prevails, where the rapid adjustability of man to new conditions is not readily assured, we may be faced with the presence of large quantities of manpower unusable with the new tools which are available.

But if the difficulties of the introduction of automation vary from one country to another and the negative consequences we have to foresee have in some countries much greater proportions, it none the less remains that each country has an equally strong interest in making the necessary progress, and that precise duties face employers, workers and governments of all nations. All those who try to shirk these duties will bear a heavy burden of guilt towards society.

The Government of my country has well understood this unavoidable need and has set up a committee of experts to study the implications of the adoption of new productive techniques so as to have a reply to the preoccupations of technicians, economists and sociologists and to the perplexities of workers' trade unions in face of the first implications of the introduction of new systems. At the same time, the Italian Government is taking pains to carry into effect the income development plan for the period 1957-66, which aims at creating, in ten years, millions of new jobs so as to absorb both the young workers in the rising generation and a large proportion of the present unemployed and also workers who are at present employed but who may become surplus after the introduction of new techniques of production. Under this plan and preceding plans the implementation of large public works of land improvement, reclamation, irrigation, construction of roads, rural and urban housing and in particular the development of the resources of southern Italy, is being pursued. All this may have considerable importance as a means of forestalling the temporary negative consequences of automation.

At the same time, the Italian Government is giving particular attention to the problem of vocational training of workers and the need for equipping them better should the passage of large numbers of workers from certain methods and certain forms of work to others be necessary.

The Act of 19 May 1955 concerning apprenticeship provides for the taking on as apprentices for a period of five years of people of up to the age of 20, providing them with supplementary education and vocational skills and reducing in this case the social security contributions to the minimum. Another Bill provides that the minimum age for employment will be raised from 14 to 15, in application of international labour Conventions in this field. At the same time we are studying the possibility of raising the school-leaving age to 15.

But more specific measures yet seem to be called for to transform the system of public education to meet the foreseeable requirements resulting from the development of technology. Vocational schools, which are being encouraged, will in the future have to be directed towards the training of skilled workers for automatic manufacture rather than towards training young people for the traditional trades. They will have to be directed more and more towards the preparation of numerous experts—people who can take charge of complicated tasks, men capable of supervising and dominating machinery and of co-ordinating and controlling the phases of production, people trained to move if necessary from one activity to another. These are the basic tasks of the modern schools, which must look more than the trade schools of the past towards the general training of young people, who will necessarily have to apply modern industrial techniques.

In this respect I may also mention the particular care which my Government is giving to the development of general and vocational training through a close network of teacher training colleges and special centres.

Italy is a country particularly rich in manpower and we may well ask ourselves whether a reduction of the working hours, combined with other measures, will not be a protection in preventing the more immediate negative consequences of the introduction of methods of automatic production. Viewpoints are divergent on this matter; I note that in this Organisation doubts have been expressed as regards the desirability of a reduction of hours of work, particularly by countries where there is a shortage of manpower and where a particular effort in the economic development of the resources of the country is necessary. I do not want to give a final viewpoint on this question or to claim that my advice is valid for all countries and all classes. But, whatever the answer to this question, what seems certain is that its examination at the international level is necessary and is one of the most urgent tasks which the I.L.O. has to fulfil. There is also need for action in other fields as a consequence of technological progress and automation. Time limits prevent me from going into details in this connection but I would like to deal with two points before concluding.

I have said that the introduction of automation brings countries face to face with varying
difficulties and varying risks of unfortunate implications. A country with great possibilities for economic development and with large untapped reserves but a deficit of manpower will react to automation by further increasing its demand for manpower—this factor which is the essential and dominating element of production. On the other hand, in countries where the possibilities of exploiting new resources are more limited and at the same time where there is a greater reserve of manpower there may, at least temporarily, be more people looking for work. We therefore need international co-operation to find new and more effective ways of freeing the movement of manpower from one part of the globe to another.

Much is said nowadays about peace and about the conditions for safeguarding it. In my view the essential requirement for really assuring peace and the good of mankind is to replace a passive conception of peace by an active conception. Peace is no longer and can no longer be the simple fact of living side by side without making war. Peace must be regarded as a state of solidarity becoming daily more comprehensive and far-reaching, a state in which everyone makes the best of his achievements available to others. The greatest hope of the country which I have the honour to represent here is that it will be in the first rank in this co-operation and that it will be among the most active in the contribution of each to the benefit of all.

It is the sincere hope of my country that an agency such as the International Labour Organisation, which has so much good work to its credit for the welfare of mankind, may be an ever more powerful and effective factor in this pursuit of more active human solidarity.

(The Conference adjourned at 1.30 p.m.)
The results of the Committee's work, reached after an extensive exchange of opinions, are, in the view of my delegation, a positive contribution to the fulfilment of the humanitarian objectives of the International Labour Organisation. The Czechoslovak Government delegates, when voting on the report as a whole, will vote in favour of the report of the Committee as well as the texts prepared by this Committee.

Mr. FRANCO NOGUEIRA (Government adviser, Portugal)—During the general discussion in the Committee on Discrimination I expressed, on behalf of the Portuguese Government delegation, the view that the instrument to be adopted should have the form of a Recommendation. This position was also taken by a considerable number of governments and by the Employers' group. A different decision, however, was taken in the Committee by the very narrow majority of 22 votes with 21 abstentions. My Government still holds the same view that the text should have the form of a Recommendation and accordingly we shall express a negative vote in regard to that part of the text dealing with the proposed Conclusions directed towards a Convention.

We are not opposed to the provisions proposed for the Convention as such; in so far as their substance is concerned we are in general agreement, and I am happy to say that they are entirely in accordance with our general policy in this field. I am not referring, of course, to point 7 of the proposed Conclusions directed towards a Convention, which we consider inacceptable inasmuch as it restricts and conditions the application of the I.L.O. Constitution. But we shall vote against the adoption of an instrument in the form of a Convention on the following grounds. We believe that some of its provisions could more appropriately become part of a Recommendation; we believe a Recommendation to be, in the present circumstances, both more effective and more useful; and finally, we think the adoption and ratification of a Convention may raise in some countries difficulties which would run counter to the very purpose we all have in mind. It may be that at the second reading the Portuguese Government may hold a different opinion if meanwhile a good case for a Convention is well established—a case which we do not believe has yet been made.

In regard to the Recommendation we shall vote in favour of this—which means in favour of the second part of the instrument, namely the Conclusions directed towards a Recommendation.

Interpretation from French: Mr. POPESCO (Workers' adviser, Romania)—I consider that it is no longer necessary to insist on the importance of the problem of discrimination. We are all convinced that discrimination, not in the field of employment alone but in all its forms, should no longer exist because it is a grave encroachment upon human dignity. When it is met with in the I.L.O. we were bound to expect that the problem of discrimination would be fairly and effectively solved, particularly since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights speaks of equal opportunity for all men, and this implies the abolition of all discrimination.

I must note, however, with regret that the results obtained in the Committee set up by the Conference to deal with the matter of the abolition of discrimination have only partly solved the problem. The report of the Committee shows that in order to obtain as large a number of ratifications as possible it would be preferable to adopt a Convention with a more limited scope, a more flexible international instrument and consequently a less effective instrument. It was even suggested that we should not include the grounds of discrimination mentioned in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Is it admissible that in the second half of the twentieth century it should still be necessary to discuss the need to abolish all the forms of discrimination still existing?

For it is public knowledge that discrimination still exists nowadays in many countries, many of them highly civilised countries. You know the facts. Racial discrimination is practised on a very wide scale; coloured people are not admitted to higher posts and cannot be promoted; they are generally allotted the heavy work, and for equal work they are paid wages much lower than those paid to white workers. I will not repeat the examples with which you are already acquainted and which bring out quite clearly that even at the present day millions of human beings continue to be the victims of discrimination.

To put an end to this situation sweeping and effective measures must be taken. The proposed Conclusions of this Committee certainly constitute a first step towards the solution of this problem and that is why I shall vote in favour. However, I trust that in the course of the second discussion which is to be held next year we shall bear in mind the considerations I have mentioned and try to give the necessary effectiveness to the various instruments with a view to the abolition of discrimination in all its forms.

Resolution concerning the Abolition of Concentration Camps and the Deportation of National Minorities, Submitted by the Committee on Forced Labour 1: Adoption

The PRESIDENT—I am interrupting this discussion to put to the Conference the three resolutions submitted by the Committee on Forced Labour, which were deferred until after the final vote on the Convention concerning the abolition of forced labour.

The first of these is the resolution concerning the abolition of concentration camps and the deportation of national minorities. If there are no observations on it, I propose to declare the resolution adopted.

(The resolution is adopted.)

1 See p. 356, and Appendices VII, p. 711, and XV, p. 786.
RESOLUTION CONCERNING METHODS OF WAGE PAYMENT, SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON FORCED LABOUR: Adoption

The PRESIDENT—We will now deal with the resolution concerning methods of wage payment. If there are no observations on that resolution, I propose to declare it adopted.

(solution is adopted.)

RESOLUTION CONCERNING DEBT BONDAGE AND SERFDOM, SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON FORCED LABOUR: Adoption

The PRESIDENT—The third is the resolution concerning debt bondage and serfdom. Again, if there are no observations, I propose to declare the resolution adopted.

(The resolution is adopted.)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISCRIMINATION: Discussion (cond.) and Adoption

The PRESIDENT—We shall now resume the discussion on the report of the Committee on Discrimination.

Interpretation from French: Mr. ROSNER (Government adviser, Poland)—During the discussion that took place in the meetings of the Committee on Discrimination, the report of which is now before us, several delegates recalled the difficult and lengthy path trodden by humanity to put an end to various privileges and inequalities before the law.

In particular they recalled certain of the most important stages in this struggle against discrimination, and the evolution that has taken place from the adoption of the Declaration of the Rights of Man at the end of the eighteenth century up to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted recently by the United Nations.

No one can deny the importance of these declarations by which the conscience of the whole world has so solemnly proclaimed the principle of the equality of all before the law. These declarations have continued to serve as a guide in the struggle against discrimination. But during this long development, which was marked by constant struggles for the liberation of the individual and the peoples, the conscience of man has arrived at a stage when it is no longer sufficient for him to declare principles. Throughout the whole world there is a demand that discrimination be recognised as a crime against humanity, and the delegate from Austria was right when he recalled this morning the dreadful price paid by certain nations because these principles of equality and liberty of peoples and individuals have been crushed underfoot by oppressors.

That is why when we broach the subject of discrimination in employment and occupation it seems to us essential that the future international instrument dealing with this subject should take the form of a Convention and contain not only definitions and principles but also precise and positive commitments on the part of those member States which ratify it to outlaw and condemn all types of discrimination.

You will see from the report that this principle of a Convention supplemented by a Recommendation is one of the most salient points in the text before you. However, we were extremely disappointed because the Committee, following the suggestions of the Office on this matter, did not adopt proposals to prohibit discrimination by means of legislation—proposals which had been made in various guises by several delegates.

What is more, the Committee even refused to transfer from the text concerning the Recommendation to that of the Convention the obligation for ratifying countries to abrogate those legislative texts which order, authorise or give legal sanction to discrimination. That seems to me to be the greatest fault of the text prepared by the Committee. In effect if you say elimination of discrimination you mean prohibition and if you wish to prohibit it then you have to have legislation and penalties for infringements. Without such legislative measures, which the ratifying State would have to take, the Convention is not a truly efficient instrument in the struggle against discrimination in the field of employment and occupation.

We have to recognise the tremendous importance of education and information in order to instil into communities the notion that discrimination is a crime against humanity. But such measures alone are insufficient if they are not supported by sound anti-discriminatory legislation.

May I in this respect be allowed to refer to the text of the report, which points out the arguments that have been invoked against the notion of legislative measures to prohibit discrimination in the field of employment and occupation? You will see on the first page of the report one of the arguments brought forward by speakers against the adoption of legislative measures, as follows: "... the varied situations within different countries and the essentiality of not encroaching upon the freedom of employers and workers to settle employment questions between themselves mediated against the adoption of a rigid instrument such as a Convention." Can you truly invoke the argument of freedom of negotiation between employers and workers when dealing with such matters as discrimination in the field of employment? I think that is going too far. This gap in the text is all the more regrettable since certain countries opposed to those legislative measures have themselves adopted laws against discrimination and their courts have given verdicts and judgments condemning this practice.

The second matter refers to the clause contained in point 5 of the proposed Conclusions directed towards a Convention. This provides for exceptions to the prohibition of discrimination in the case of measures relating to the "national security of a Member." A deplorable practice, which is unhappily very common in certain countries, shows us the abuses to which
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