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MINUTES OF THE 205TH SESSION

The 205th Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva from Tuesday, 28 February to Friday, 3 March 1978.

The Governing Body was composed as follows:

Chairman: Mr. MORRIS

Government group:

Australia: Mr. FOGARTY
Brazil: Mr. GOMES CHIARELLI
Canada: Mr. MAINWARING
France: Mr. VENTEJOL
Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. HAASE
Hungary: Mr. SY
India: Mr. DOMOKOS
Iran: Mr. RAGHUPATHI
Italy: Mr. AZIMI
Japan: Mr. AGO
Kuwait: Mr. IWA T
Liberia: Mr. DABBAGH
Libya: Mrs. RICKS MArSH
Mexico: Miss GONZALEZ MARTINEZ
Netherlands: Mr. HELDAL
Pakistan: Mr. YUNUS
Panama: Mr. VILLAMONTE RAMOS
Peru: Mr. OSMAN
Papua New Guinea: Mr. O.M. AHMED
Philippines: Mr. ALASSOUNGUMA
Poland: Mr. CORBIE
Portugal: Mr. KOSTINE
Romania: Mr. BODGKINS
Sudan: Mr. CASTELLANOS
Togo: Mr. FRANIC
Trinidad and Tobago: Mr. BINTU'a-Tshiabola
USSR:
Employers' group:

Mr. I.M. AHMED
Mr. BERGENSTRÖM
Mr. COATES
Mr. DIALLO DRAHÉY
Mr. GHAOÛRE
Mr. LINDBERG
Mr. MARTINEZ ESPINO O.
Mr. NASR
Mr. OECHELIN
Mr. OLA
Mr. POLITES
Mr. RICHAN
Mr. TATA
Mr. YLLANES RAMOS

Workers' group:

Mr. GONZALEZ NAVARRO
Mr. HARAOGUCHI
Mr. HAWK
Mr. LLOYD
Mr. MAKKHALOUF
Mr. MEHTA
Mr. MORRIS
Mr. MUHR
Mr. ODEYEMI
Mr. PIMENOV
Mr. ROBEL
Mr. SANCHEZ MADARIAGA
Mr. SUNDE
Mr. ZAIDI

The following regular members were absent:

Government group:

China

Employers' group:

Mr. SMITH
Mr. VEGH GARZON

Workers' group:

Mr. BROWN
Mr. HERRERAS

The following deputy members, or substitute deputy members, were present at all or some of the sittings:
Government group:

Argentina: Mr. DALL'ASTA
Austria: Mr. MELAS
Burundi: Mr. NDABAHAGAMYE
Cameroon (United Republic of): Mr. GUESSO GO NKONO
Colombia: Mr. CHARRY SAMPER
Cuba: Mr. LECHUGA HEVIA
Greece: Mr. METAXAS
Honduras: Mr. COLLART-VALLE
Indonesia: Mr. KULFINSKI
Poland: Mr. ENE
Romania: Mr. KAMARA
Sierra Leone: Mr. de ALWIS
Sri Lanka: Mr. MAKUTIKA
Thailand: Mr. SANGTONG
Tanzania: Mr. CHERIF
Turkey: Mr. YAVUZALP

Employers' group:

Mr. AL-JASEM
Mr. ASFOOR
Mr. BANNERMAN-MENSON
Mr. BENJAMIN
Mr. CHAMBERS
Mr. CONDE BANDRES
Mr. GONZALES BLANCO
Mr. LEE
Mr. MONT BALMACEDA
Mr. MFOOKO KINGUE
Mr. POLESE
Mr. SEYDI
Mr. VERSCHUEREN
Mr. ZALILA

Workers' group:

Mr. K. AHMED
Mr. BEN ISRAEL
Mr. COFFIE
Mr. PASSINA
Mrs. FILIPAS
Mr. KIKONGI di MWINSA
Mr. MAIER
Mr. MENDOZA
Mr. SALANNE
Mr. SUDANNE
Mr. ZINBA

The following deputy members were absent:

Employers' group:

Mr. VITAIC JAKASA

Workers' group:

Mr. DIAZ RAGA
Mr. GHARIB
Mr. SOLOMON

The following representatives of States Members of the Organisation invited under article 26, paragraph 5, of the Constitution were present:
The following representatives of States Members of the Organisation were present:

Bolivia: Mr. CABALLERO TAMAYO
Uruguay: Mr. REAL

Algeria: Mr. BRiki
Belgium: Miss MARQUEGNIES
Bulgaria: Mr. STEFANOV
Byelorussian SSR: Mr. LUKIANOVITCH
Chile: Mr. TRUCCO
Czechoslovakia: Mr. CIZEK
Denmark: Mr. LAURBERG
Egypt: Mr. KHALIFA
Finland: Mr. RIIKONEN
German Democratic Republic: Mr. NOACK
Ireland: Mr. GAYNOR
Israel: Mr. BARRONI
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: Mr. OTHMAN
Malta: Mr. BORG
Mongolia: Mr. BAYARTE
Netherlands: Mr. SOHNS
New Zealand: Mr. ROSS
Nigeria: Mr. WILLIAMS
Peru: Mr. CHAVEZ GODOY
Philippines: Mr. WALDO
Portugal: Mr. MARIA ALEIXO
Spain: Mr. BENITO MESTRE
Sweden: Mr. BOUVIN
Switzerland: Mr. ZENGER
Ukrainian SSR: Mr. GRIGRICHENKO

The following were also present:

Mr. BLANCHARD, Director-General
Mr. BOLIN, Deputy Director-General
Mr. MCDONALD, Deputy Director-General
Mr. JAIN, Deputy Director-General
Mr. WOLF, Assistant Director-General; Legal Adviser
Mr. ASTAPENKO, Assistant Director-General
Mr. BURGAN, Assistant Director-General
Mr. BURGAW, Assistant Director-General; Treasurer and Financial Comptroller
Mr. VALTICOS, Assistant Director-General; Adviser for International Labour Standards
Mr. MILNE, Assistant Director-General
Mr. SACIKA, Assistant Director-General

Representatives of international governmental organisations:

United Nations: Mr. QUIJANO-CABALLERO
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development: Mr. JENNINGS
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: Mr. MORARU
United Nations Development Programme: Mr. IDOUX
United Nations Institute for Training and Research: Mr. GEISER
United Nations Industrial Development Organisation: Mr. PATWARAJAH
United Nations Environment Programme: Mrs. SCHNEIDER
World Health Organisation: Dr. EL BATAWI

Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organisation: Mr. MASSON
International Atomic Energy Agency: Mrs. OPELZ
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade: Mr. CASTILLA
League of Arab States: Mr. AL-DEIRI
Arab Labour Organisation: Mr. NOUR
Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration: Mr. BUENO do PRADO
Council of Europe: Mr. REBORG
Commission of the European Communities: Mr. PEEL
Organisation of American States: Mr. HURTADO de MENDOZA
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development: Mr. ARIK

Representatives of international non-governmental organisations:

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions: Mr. VANDERVEKEN
International Organisation of Employers: Mr. LAGASSE
International Social Security Association: Mr. KAISER
World Confederation of Labour: Mr. FRENETTE
World Federation of Trade Unions: Mr. IBRAHIM

Substitutes and advisers:

Mr. AGUIRIANO, accompanying Mr. VANDERVEKEN
Mr. AL-AWADHI, substitute for Mr. DABBAGH
Mr. ALBALAT LAFITA, accompanying Mr. BENITO MESTRE
Mr. ALDEA, accompanying Mr. ENE
Miss AL-HAMDAN, substitute for Mr. DABBAGH
Mr. AMARO FOURSCEL, substitute for Mr. DALL'ASTA
Mr. de ANGELI, accompanying Mr. IBRAHIM
Mr. ASHTON, accompanying Mr. HODGKINS
Mr. AVRAH, accompanying Mr. VENTEJOL
Mr. BACCOUHE, accompanying Mr. LAGASSE
Mr. BANGOURA, substitute for Mr. SY
Mr. BARBEDO ARREGIO, accompanying Mr. GOMES CHIARELLI
Mr. BARBEWAGURE, substitute for Mr. NDABAHAGAMYE
Mr. BERNARDEL, accompanying Mr. POLESE
Miss BOCETA, accompanying Mr. BENITO MESTRE
Mr. BOLLANGA, substitute for Mr. GUESSOOG NKONO
Mr. BORDAINE, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. BRECKENBIDGE, substitute for Mr. DE ALWIS
Mr. BRUAA, accompanying Mr. HELDAL
Mr. BUCHSBAUM, accompanying Mr. VENTEJOL
Mr. CAIRO SOLER, accompanying Mr. LECHUGA HEVIA
Mr. CANKUR, accompanying Mr. YAVUZALP
Mr. CANO de SANTANTA, accompanying Mr. BENITO MESTRE
Ms. CARON, substitute for Mr. MAINWARING
Mr. CASSON, accompanying Mr. QUIJANO-CABALLERO
Mr. CHANDRAKSHARAN, accompanying Mr. LAGASSE
Mr. CORDT-HANSEN, accompanying Mr. HELDAL
Mr. CORNELL, accompanying Mr. BOUVIN
Ms. DALL, accompanying Mr. BERGENSTROM
Mr. DAVENPORT, accompanying Mr. GAYNOR
Mr. DELARRE, substitute for Mr. VENTEJOL
Mr. DUKLIC-TRAJKOVIC, accompanying Mr. FRANIC
Mr. DIRIE, substitute for Mr. OSMAN
Mr. DOUBININE, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. EL FAZAA, accompanying Mr. CHERIF
Mrs. ENGELEN-KEFEB, accompanying Mr. MUHR
Mr. FAHMY, accompanying Mr. AL-DEIRI
Mrs. FAUCHERE, accompanying Mr. FRENETTE
Mr. FLOBEA, accompanying Mrs. FILIPAS
Mr. FONTENEAU, accompanying Mr. FRENETTE
Ms. FREEMAN, substitute for Mr. FOGARTY
Mr. FRONCZAK, substitute for Mr. KULPINSKI
Mr. GABAGLIO, accompanying Mr. FASSINA
Mr. GONZALEZ IQQUIENDO, substitute for Mr. LECHUGA HEVIA
Miss GRAINGER, accompanying Mr. ROSS
Mr. GRIPPIN, substitute for Mr. CASTELLANOS
Mr. GRUNDBERG, accompanying Mr. BOUVIN
Mr. GUERBOV, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. GUIJARRO-ZUBIZARRETA, accompanying Mr. LAGASSE
Mr. HAMBERGER, substitute for Mr. HAASE
Mr. HAGEN, accompanying Mr. SOHNS
Ms. HAK, accompanying Mr. VESCHUEREN
Mr. HASHMI, substitute for Mr. YUNUS
Mr. HEALY, substitute for Mr. CONDES
Mr. HECKEL, accompanying Mr. NOACK
Mr. HEINZEMANN, accompanying Mr. LINDNER
Mr. HESS, substitute for Mr. HODGKINS
Mr. HETER, accompanying Mr. MUHR
Mr. HUMPHRIES, accompanying Mr. LLOYD
Mr. HUSSAINI, substitute for Mr. DABBAGH
Mr. IBRAHIM, accompanying Mr. BASRI
Mr. INAL, accompanying Mr. YAVUZALP
Mr. ISACSSON, accompanying Mr. BOUVIN
Mr. ISHIKAWA, substitute for Mr. IWATA
Mr. JANES, accompanying Mr. HODGKINS
Mr. JIMENEZ DAVILA, substitute for Mr. DALL'ASTA
Mr. JONG, accompanying Mr. SOHNS
Mr. KANTERMIROV, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. KARY, substitute for Mr. AZIMI
Mr. KOCSIS, substitute for Mr. DOMOKOS
Mr. LABRUNE, accompanying Mr. IBRAHIM
Mr. LAGOS, accompanying Mr. TRUCCO
Mr. LILLIHÖÖK, substitute for Mr. BERGENSTRÖM
Mrs. LISBOA de NECER, accompanying Mr. CASTELLANOS
Mr. LISITSKY, accompanying Mr. QUIJANO-CABALLERO
Mr. LOMBERA FALLARES, substitute for Miss GONZALEZ MARTINEZ
Mr. LUKABU K'Habouji, accompanying Mr. BINTU'a-Tshiabola
Ms. LUNDY, accompanying Mr. MAINWARING
Mr. MACAULEY, accompanying Mr. KAMARA
Mr. MACINNESS, accompanying Mr. HODGKINS
Mr. MALIKOV, substitute for Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. MARANGE, accompanying Mr. VENTEJOL
Mr. MARTON, substitute for Mr. DOMOKOS
Mr. MAUREL, accompanying Mr. PEEL
Mrs. MENDEZ ARCEO, accompanying Miss GONZALEZ MARTINEZ
Mr. MERONI, accompanying Mr. ZANGER
Mr. MITAIYEV, accompanying Mr. PIMENOV
Mr. MOCACAIN, accompanying Mr. PATHERAJAH
Mr. MOBILES, substitute for Mr. CHERRY SAMPER
Mr. MÜLLER, accompanying Mr. NOACK
Mr. MULONGANDUSU, accompanying Mr. BINTU'a-Tshiabola
Mr. NAIR, substitute for Mr. BAGHUPATHI
Mr. NARITA, accompanying Mr. LAGASSE
Mr. NASIER, accompanying Mr. BASRI
Mr. NEMO, accompanying Mr. VENTEJOL
Mr. NOCIDO, accompanying Mr. AGO
Mr. NOTERDAEME, accompanying Miss MARQUEGNIUS
Ms. ÖDMAN, accompanying Mr. BOUVIN
Mr. OLZVOY, accompanying Mr. BAYARTE
Mr. OURMET, accompanying Mr. VENTEJOL
Mr. PAXINOS, accompanying Mr. METAXAS
Mr. PINI, accompanying Mr. AGO
Mr. PRIANO, substitute for Mr. DALL'ASTA
Mr. PURPURA, substitute for Mr. AGO
Mrs. RAELI, accompanying Mr. BARRONI
Mr. REANTRAGOON, substitute for Mr. SANGTONG
Miss ROCHE, accompanying Mr. OECHELIN
Mr. RODIE, accompanying Mr. BUENO de PRADO
Mrs. ROOS, accompanying Mr. RIIKONEN
Mrs. SAKAMOTO, accompanying Mr. IWATA
Mr. SANGBANA, substitute for Mr. ALASSOOUNOUA
Mrs. SASSO-MASSUFFERI, accompanying Mr. POLESE
Mr. K. SATO, substitute for Mr. IWATA
Mr. S. SATO, accompanying Mr. IWATA
Mr. SIDERIS, accompanying Mr. METAXAS
Mr. SNOXELL, accompanying Mr. HODGKINS
Mr. SODHI, substitute for Mr. RAGHUPATHI
Mr. SRESHTHAPUTRA, accompanying Mr. SANGTONG
Mr. SUSSEX, accompanying Mr. VANDERVEKEN
Mr. SZENASI, accompanying Mr. DOMOKOS
Mr. THIBAULT, accompanying Mr. MAINWARING
Mr. TOPERI, substitute for Mr. YAVUZALP
Mr. TORENG, substitute for Mr. HELDAL
Miss TRAZIVUK, accompanying Mr. FRANIC
Mr. TSOUKATOS, accompanying Mr. METAXAS
Mr. TUDOR, substitute for Mr. ENE
Miss ULBRICHT, accompanying Mr. LAGASSE
Mr. VALIKANGAS, accompanying Mr. RIIKONEN
Mr. VAN DUÍSE, accompanying Miss MARQUEGNIES
Mr. de VRIES-REILINGH, accompanying Mr. VANDERVEKEN
Miss WEBSTER, accompanying Mrs. OPELZ
Mr. WILMEESTADT, accompanying Mr. HAASE
Mr. WIRTH, accompanying Mr. HAASE
Mr. WISSEH, accompanying Mrs. RICKS MARSH
Mr. WOOLCOTT, accompanying Mr. HODGKINS
Miss YAMANE, accompanying Mr. HAASCHI
Mr. YOUSSEF, accompanying Mr. NOUR
Mr. ZOUPANOS, accompanying Mr. QUIJANO-CABALLERO
FIRST SITTING
(Tuesday, 28 February 1978, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.10 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Morris.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

The Chairman welcomed those present, in particular the Government representatives attending a Governing Body session in that capacity for the first time.

In reply to a question from Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), the Director-General said that, when the Governing Body came to the eleventh item on its agenda - the reports of its Committee on Freedom of Association - he would make a statement on the mission which his representative, Mr. Bolin, Deputy Director-General, had just carried out to Tunisia. ¹

FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Approval of the minutes of the 204th Session

The Governing Body approved the minutes of its 204th Session.

SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Appointment of the Director-General

The Chairman said that the Officers of the Governing Body, having given some thought to the matter, considered that the present item should be dealt with in private sitting. He accordingly proposed that the Governing Body should adjourn and reconvene in private sitting in 15 minutes' time.

In accordance with the practice followed by the Governing Body on similar occasions, access to the private sitting would be limited to the regular Government members and their substitutes, the deputy Government members and their substitutes, the regular Employer and Worker members and their substitutes, the deputy Employer and Worker members and their substitutes, the Secretary of the Employers' group and the Secretary of the Workers' group. The secretariat would consist exclusively of the Legal Adviser, the Chief of the Relations and Meetings Department, the Clerk of the Governing Body and his assistant, the Chief of the Employers' Relations Branch, the Chief of the Workers' Relations Branch, the Secretary of the Governing Body, interpreters and interpretation operators.

The sitting closed at 10.15 a.m.

¹ See below, pp. VII/3-4.
SECOND SITTING (PRIVATE)
(Tuesday, 28 February 1978, morning)

At this sitting, which was held in private, the Governing Body appointed the Director-General of the International Labour Office.

In accordance with article 14, paragraph 3, of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the minutes of this sitting are being issued separately. An account of the proceedings was, however, given by the Chairman at the beginning of the following public sitting; see below, p. III/1.
THIRD SITTING
(Tuesday, 28 February 1978, morning)

The sitting opened at 11.45 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Morris.

SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Appointment of the Director-General (concl.)

The Chairman, reporting on the private sitting held that morning to appoint the Director-General, said that, a ballot vote having been taken, the Governing Body had, by 51 votes in favour and 1 against, with 1 abstention, re-elected Mr. Francis Blanchard as Director-General for a further period of five years from the date of expiry of his present appointment, i.e. from February 1979.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) offered Mr. Blanchard the Workers' hearty congratulations on his reappointment, which bore witness to the Governing Body's full confidence in him. For four years the Workers had enjoyed frank and fruitful co-operation with him and they looked forward to doing so for another six. They wished him every success in meeting the many challenges the future no doubt held in store.

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed the Employers' deep satisfaction at the reappointment of Mr. Blanchard and offered him best wishes for health and success in the years ahead.

Mr. Castellanos (Government, Venezuela) joined in congratulating the Director-General and in wishing his success.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) offered the Director-General warm congratulations. The ILO was going through a difficult time, and there might be worse to come, but the Mexican Government had faith in Mr. Blanchard's qualities of leadership, experience, ability and devotion to the Organisation and felt that the Governing Body could not have chosen a better man.

Mrs. Ricks-Marsh (Government, Liberia) said that the Government members of the Group of 77 offered the Director-General their best wishes and looked forward to continuing to work with him. By his vigorous and zealous leadership he had done much already and would achieve yet more.

Mr. Caron (Government, Canada) offered the Director-General the congratulations and best wishes of the Government members belonging to the group of industrialized market-economy countries.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) warmly congratulated the Director-General and wished him success on behalf of the Government members of Western Europe. During his year as Chairman of the Governing Body he had come to esteem Mr. Blanchard for his ability, experience and sense of fair play and, at the 1977 session of the Conference in particular, for his unflagging devotion to duty and determination to overcome difficulties. He hoped that Mr. Blanchard would continue to find his work as rewarding an experience as he professed it had been so far.

Mr. Yunus (Government, Pakistan) joined in offering best wishes to Mr. Blanchard, whose reappointment would ensure that continuity of leadership which the ILO sorely needed in these troubled times.

The Director-General expressed his deep gratitude for the decision the Governing Body had just taken, for the kind – perhaps too kind – words of previous speakers and for the warm good wishes which the Officers of the Governing Body had offered him after informing him earlier that morning of the result of the vote.

The Governing Body's decision gave him the honour of carrying on for another five years in the service of the whole ILO membership as head of the Office.
In renewing its trust in him the Governing Body had fulfilled a deep and secret wish of his to be given the time to finish the job. Although much that was worth while had been accomplished in the past four years - for example the World Employment Conference and the maritime session of the General Conference - it had also been an unusually trying and troubled time. Nor was there any reason to believe that the period ahead would be trouble free. He knew from experience that the task would be a hard one, but drew enormous encouragement from the support the Governing Body had been kind enough to show him.

Throughout the arduous and captivating years he had spent in the ILO's service and at the head of the Office, in the course of his travels and in conversations he had had in Geneva and elsewhere at such major gatherings as the General Conference, regional conferences and Governing Body sessions, he had taken the measure of the esteem felt for the Organisation, the reverence for its principles, the authority commanded by its standards, the respect for its procedures and the value set upon its assistance.

The ILO had of course just experienced a severe ordeal. But that ordeal should strengthen its will to carry on with renewed fervour and to achieve its abiding aims: safeguarding human rights, creating employment, fulfilling basic needs, and improving working conditions and the working environment - in short, building society on the foundations of justice and freedom.

If it stood by its noblest traditions the ILO would recover that universal dimension laid down in its Constitution and go from strength to strength in the noble fight it was waging.

It would need, more than ever before, to be closely attuned to a world thrust forward by earth-shaking events, where hope mingled with fear and strife with tolerance. That would require adaptation of its structures and means of action, an ever keener awareness of the problems of the regions - and particularly of the least developed countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America - and a more purposeful effort to help to build an economic and social order of which the principles and aims would draw inspiration from the Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia - texts which still had a striking relevance to the problems of today.

To launch that new era, and to meet the constant challenges facing the Organisation and the Office, the Director-General could rely on the men and women who made up the staff. As he had often said, they did credit to the international civil service and over the past few years had given the full measure of their abilities and devotion. On this rare occasion he wished to thank the other members of the directorate, who had shared so many of his hopes and anxieties and on whose co-operation he knew he could rely, and indeed all members of the staff, whether they worked in Geneva or in the field, who had never lost heart and were striving ever harder to help the ILO to achieve its aims.

He believed that, with the situation fully restored to normal, he could achieve an aim he had never lost sight of and recruit new and young staff, in scrupulous accordance with the rules laid down by the Governing Body, but also with a real concern to achieve better geographical distribution in the Office.

With support from the staff he would bend all efforts to ensure that governments, employers and workers made the most of what the ILO had to offer, that they came together and worked out agreements to meet their manifold and legitimate aspirations and that they protected the ILO from trends irrelevant to its concerns.

He would strive, too, to improve the ILO\'s procedures - but thoughtfully, so as not to imperil what had been built up - to put its finances on sound and lasting foundations and, in managing the Office, to preserve and enhance the skills and cohesiveness of its staff.

In the emotion and joy he felt at this moment he might be forgiven if he went on to elaborate on his belief that the ILO still offered the promise of a world in which an abiding concern for man could reconcile material and spiritual progress with freedom. Surely everyone would agree that, for all the tensions that might sometimes hamper its advance, the ILO was still the main instrument of the United Nations system for achieving social progress. The Director-General solemnly vowed to do his utmost to protect the ILO and to devote his strength to improving the workers' lot the world over.

The sitting closed at 12.15 p.m.
FOURTH SITTING
(Tuesday, 28 February 1978, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 4.05 p.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Morris.

THIRD ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report on the Symposium on the Training of Workers' Representatives for Participation in Decisions within Undertakings
(Geneva, 10-21 October 1977)

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking for the Workers, recalled that the symposium held in Oslo in August 1974 on workers' participation in decisions within undertakings had highlighted the importance of participation as a means of making workers less dependent on the will of others, promoting democracy in social structures other than the state apparatus and checking management decisions aimed at exerting a political influence. The Oslo Symposium had shown these considerations to be equally relevant to other forms of participation, notably collective bargaining.

The report now before the Governing Body made it clear that for participation to work well two conditions should be met. First, the workers' representatives needed sound training in economic and social questions. They should have as firm a grasp of such questions as the employers' spokesmen.

The second condition was that trade unions themselves should provide the training. It was they who, apart from enjoying the workers' trust, were best fitted, on the workers' side, to see the interests of the enterprise in a wide perspective and to take account of broader economic and social considerations. State financing should therefore be provided to help the trade unions to strengthen worker participation by training worker representatives, provided, however, that the State had no say in determining the content of the training. Such financing would, after all, be only fair, since the State, in a sense, already bore the cost of training managers and other employer representatives, e.g. by granting tax concessions to employers for training expenses. In the Federal Republic of Germany as much as half of the amount of such expenses might be deductible from the employer's tax liability.

Paragraphs 73 to 79 of the report made good suggestions for ILO action and the Workers urged the Director-General to take full account of them in planning programmes.

Since the subject of the Symposium had been mainly of interest to workers, it was important that the report should reach their organisations. The Workers therefore proposed that the Office should forward it to those organisations directly, and not through governments, and that the recommendation in paragraph 8(b) of the Office paper should be amended through the deletion of the words "and through them".

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman), speaking for the Employers, observed that some of Mr. Muhr's remarks, for example those on ways of financing training and education, were relevant only to countries like his own; other countries might prefer other ways.

The Employers had no objection to Mr. Muhr's proposal for amending paragraph 8(b) of the Office paper, although there might be practical difficulties in sending the report directly to employers' and workers' organisations in some countries.

The Governing Body adopted the proposals in paragraph 8 of the Office paper, with the deletion of "and through them" in subparagraph (b).
FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the International Symposium on Safety and Health of Migrant Workers
(Cavtat, 31 October-4 November 1977)

Mr. Muhrt (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the Workers' gratitude to the Government of Yugoslavia for playing host to the Symposium. In their view the Symposium had been a success, and they would like the Office to see how its conclusions could be reflected in the International Programme for Working Conditions and Environment (PIACT) and other programmes.

The Symposium had drawn attention to matters of concern not only to the ILO but to other United Nations agencies as well - for example the problems mentioned in paragraphs 10, 12 and 13 of the report. It was a pity, however, that the report contained no suggestions for bringing about wider observance of Convention No. 143 and Recommendation No. 151, which set standards on many matters relating to migrants' safety and health.

The Symposium had made it clear that the home country, too, bore responsibility for protecting migrants and, in particular, equipping them to cope with the risks to which, for occupational reasons and because of language difficulties, they were especially exposed. That these risks affected migrants more than other workers - a point brought out in paragraph 8 of the report - was not, of course, due so much to their status as migrants as to the fact that they tended to get the jobs requiring the lowest skills, which also happened to be the most dangerous. The solution was to improve the skills of migrant workers and give them adequate language instruction.

In paragraph 15 of the report it was said that the Office was to publish the record of the proceedings "in agreement with the Yugoslav authorities". The Workers trusted that publication would not depend on the consent of the Yugoslav Government.

Mr. Ola (Employer, Nigeria) said that the Employers found the report quite unacceptable. It had not been approved by the participants - and the composition of the Symposium had been lopsided anyway - and it was full of sweeping, tendentious and inaccurate statements, of which he would give but a few examples.

First, paragraph 8 of the report said that industrial accidents were "a major cause of disability and absenteeism" among immigrant workers. That was no less true of migrant national workers: for example, the accident rate among workers who moved from a rural to an industrial urban area was higher than the rate among urban workers. Under Factories Acts the employer was often bound to give new and inexperienced workers proper training before putting them to work on machinery without supervision.

Secondly, according to paragraph 9 immigrants were commonly given more hazardous work than nationals. However, in one European country three-quarters of all those employed underground in coal mines - and that was dangerous work if any was - belonged to one ethnic group of the national population.

Thirdly, paragraph 10 said that the usual practice was just to check that the migrant was fit for work by "general criteria relating to physical fitness and physical and mental capacities". Those were precisely the same criteria as were applied in examining national workers when they took up employment, and indeed to apply stricter criteria to immigrants would be to discriminate against national workers.

Fourthly, in paragraph 12 it was said that where an undertaking employed over 20 migrants of the same nationality they should choose a safety officer from among themselves - as if such a small group could reasonably be expected to include in all cases someone with a knowledge of safety and health problems. Another impractical idea was that labour inspectors and instructors from the home country should help in the safety and health training of migrant workers in the host country.

In short, the results of the exercise afforded no sound basis for further action under PIACT to improve the safety and health of migrant workers. The ILO, in fact, already had instruments which gave useful and detailed guidance on the subject, such as Conventions Nos. 97 and 143 and Recommendations Nos. 100 and 151.
Mr. Franic (Government, Yugoslavia) said that his country had been pleased to act as host to the Symposium. There being almost a million Yugoslavs working abroad in Europe and elsewhere, his Government took a keen interest in the subject of migrants' safety and health. In its view the meeting had proved useful, and Mr. Ola's remarks, though perhaps not the Employers' dislike of the report, were rather surprising.

Whether, as Mr. Ola had said, the accident rate was higher also among national workers who migrated within a country was beside the point. The fact of the matter was that foreign workers did show greater proneness to accidents. Nor could it be denied that they were commonly engaged in dangerous work. The host countries did not follow a deliberate policy of offering them such work; it was simply a fact of life that immigrants took whatever work was on offer, and that work, though perhaps as dignified as any other, happened to be dangerous and arduous.

In fact, the meeting had shed interesting light on migrants' problems. True, some of them were common to national workers, but the Symposium had not been concerned with such workers. As Mr. Ola had said, immigrants usually had to undergo the same medical examinations as nationals on taking up work; but every country had its own regulations on safety and health, minimum age for employment, retirement, check-ups and so on, and what really mattered was whether immigrants were getting not so much the same treatment as nationals as the treatment they needed for their own protection.

Besides, the Symposium had merely provided a forum, and the fact that different views were recorded in the report was no reason for the Governing Body to dismiss it out of hand. On the contrary, it would be wise to take those views into account in pursuing efforts to improve safety and health for migrants and to take up many of the suggestions that had been made — for carrying out check-ups before migrants left home, in the course of their employment and on their return, for improving the collection and analysis of statistics and so on. It had been an excellent idea to bring experts together from different countries to go into the whole subject, and the outcome had proved it.

Mr. Villanes Fajos (Employer, Mexico) noted that according to paragraph 14 of the report "more and more migrant workers have been voluntarily returning home". An article in a recent issue of ILO Information, which had been published in several languages and sent all over the world, said quite the opposite — that migrants were not going home. Which statement was true? Besides, the article began: "Western Europe's migrant workers have overstayed their welcome" — an insulting remark of a kind that should never find its way into any ILO publication.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France) preferred the traditional kind of tripartite ILO meeting to meetings like the Cavtat Symposium.

Participation in the Symposium had been open to anyone willing to go to Cavtat at his own expense, and while the Yugoslav Government had made generous arrangements for the participants, they themselves had had to bear most of the cost. That was why, as was said in paragraph 4 of the report, the ILO had finally had to pay the costs of participation of another 13 specialists, and even then tripartite representation had not been balanced. The ILO had adopted the same method to change the composition of the Vienna Symposium on collective bargaining, and although the results of that meeting had been better a method which worked well only half the time was not a good one.

Secondly, the report before the Governing Body was of doubtful authority. It had not been approved by the Symposium itself but was the work of the Office and purported to record merely the different views that had been aired, not any consensus that might have emerged.

The report was a rather summary document, considering the large number of participants, and it was hard to tell whether it accurately reflected the opinions expressed at the meeting or merely the personal impressions or preferences of its author. If the report were given wide currency the press and many others might mistake it for a statement of the ILO's own views. Yet clearly it contained passages — and Mr. Ola had cited some of them — to which the ILO as a whole could not subscribe.

It would be a mistake to use the report as a basis for developing the PIAC, which should instead reflect the agreed outcome of tripartite discussion. The report of the Meeting of Experts on Limits of Exposure to Dangerous Airborne Substances - the sixth agenda item - made a striking contrast. The composition of that meeting had been perfectly tripartite and the ILO could assume full responsibility for its conclusions. The present document, on the other hand, could be considered only as an information paper submitted to the Governing Body.

Mr. Händler (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) observed that in fact the Governing Body was not being asked even to take note of the report, far less approve it. It was far from easy to write a fair summary of what had been said at a symposium like the one held in Cavtat.

His Government took a deep interest in the subject and thanked the ILO for holding the meeting and the Yugoslav Government for acting as host. He wished however, in a constructive spirit, to make certain comments which he hoped would be kept in mind for the future.

First, the discussion had ranged too widely. One participant sent by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany had felt that the subjects for discussion had not been defined precisely enough, with the result that attention had not always concentrated on the concrete issues which were the proper concern of the meeting. Time had been wasted talking about seasonal workers, workers who crossed an international frontier every day, and even commuters. At future meetings of this kind speakers should be called to order if they digressed too often.

Secondly, the composition of the meeting was open to criticism. For instance, there had been no trade union representative from the Federal Republic of Germany, despite that country's large immigrant workforce and extensive experience in the matter. It seemed that it had not been possible to find someone who knew English or French well enough to take part since, perhaps to save money, German had unfortunately not been a working language.

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the Employers, though glad to join in an expression of thanks to the host government, were thoroughly dissatisfied with the arrangements for the meeting, the proceedings themselves and the report now before the Governing Body.

To meet a request from the Employers, who had expressed misgivings last November about the composition of symposia and other technical meetings, the Director-General had said that, perhaps at the present session, he would submit a paper reviewing the rules and criteria covering the work, composition, agenda and financing of symposia and other technical meetings. Had such a paper been prepared?

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) said that her Government had taken a keen interest in the Symposium, which, though it had concentrated on the lot of migrant workers in Europe, had dealt with problems of world-wide concern and of interest not only to the ILO but to other organisations as well, such as the WHO, which had co-sponsored the meeting.

It would therefore be a great pity if, because of the Employers' criticisms - which would be recorded in the minutes anyway - no account were taken of the report. The Director-General might at some future session give the Governing Body fuller information on the papers presented at the Symposium, which had apparently been useful and covered such topics as physical and psychological disorders of migrants, industrial accident rates and the illnesses to which, for climatic or other reasons, different classes of migrants were prone.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), coming as he did from a country with a large immigrant workforce, felt bound to challenge Mr. Ola's remarks.

It was a plain fact that migrant workers were more prone to illness than others, either because of the kind of work they did or because the climate or other conditions of the environment were not the same in the host country as in their own. Migrants needed time to get used to changes in diet and to the pressures of new kinds of work, and that, too, might put a strain on their health or even heighten the risk of accident.
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Again, many migrant workers did not have a good enough command of the language of the host country to cope with everyday problems or even, to give one example, to understand safety signs or advice.

True, the same criteria of health might be applied in examining immigrants as in examining national workers, but the important point, brought out in paragraph 10 of the report, was that all too seldom did migrant workers undergo the right sort of medical check-ups before leaving home, either because there were not enough doctors or because the doctors did not know what conditions the worker would be working in abroad or even what sort of mental and physical demands his work would make on him.

Mr. Yllanes Ramos had asked whether or not it was a fact that migrants were going back home. So far as the Federal Republic of Germany was concerned, some 700,000 foreign workers, or perhaps a million people if one counted their families as well, had left in the past two years. Unfortunately many of them had had to go against their will because of the employment situation in the country.

All these were questions which might have a bearing on ILO programmes, and the ILO should not simply overlook them, as Mr. Ola seemed to be suggesting.

The Workers did agree with Mr. Oeschlin, however, that it was better to have tripartite meetings of the traditional kind, for which the Governing Body could ensure a balanced composition, than symposia like the one under discussion.

Mr. Ahmed (Worker, Pakistan) endorsed Mr. Muhr's remarks.

Mr. Inal (Government, Turkey) agreed with what Mr. Franic and Mr. Muhr had said. The report was accurate and well balanced and made constructive suggestions and comments - particularly those in paragraphs 10, 12 and 13 - of which ILO programmes should take account.

Mr. Chérif (Government, Tunisia) said that his own and other countries whose citizens went abroad to work took a keen interest in the subject of the Symposium and felt that the report raised many points which bore looking into further.

At the same time, some views recorded in it were either unclear or mistaken. For example, the statement in paragraph 14 that "more and more workers have been voluntarily returning home" was not true. In fact it was official policy in several countries to send migrants home - sometimes, as was said in the article in ILO information, with some financial inducement. The sentence would therefore have been more accurate without the word "voluntarily".

The Director-General understood that the idea it had been intended to convey in the first sentence of paragraph 14 corresponded to what Mr. Chérif had said.

At any rate, the report now before the Governing Body was submitted to it for information only, not for approval, and neither it nor the summary record of the proceedings, to be published in the Occupational Safety and Health Series, would commit the ILO in any way. Perhaps the preface to the record might include a disclaimer of ILO responsibility for any of the views expressed.

Nor would the Office regard the Cavtat Symposium as the last word on the subject. Unlike that held in Vienna on collective bargaining, it had not reached any specific conclusions, but had marked only one step in the ILO's continuing efforts to deal with a difficult and topical problem; and though opinions might differ about what it had actually achieved, to that extent it had been a useful exercise whose results it would be a mistake, and a pity, to reject out of hand. Certainly the Yugoslav Government had done everything to ensure success and was to be thanked for its cordial hospitality to the many participants.

As to Mr. Muhr's question about the last sentence of the report, all that was meant was that it had been agreed with the Yugoslav authorities that it was the Office who would publish the record of proceedings.

Unfortunately the Office's burden of work since last November had prevented it from preparing the paper on symposia and other meetings referred to by Mr. Bergenström, but the paper would be circulated in good time before the next session. The Director-General hoped, however, that the Governing Body would not give up the practice of holding such meetings, especially on subjects like occupational safety and health, to which they served to alert specialist and lay opinion.
Mr. Bergenstrås (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the Employers were not wholly satisfied with the method of choosing participants for such meetings and looked forward to receiving the material promised by the Director-General.

The Governing Body adopted the proposal in paragraph 2 of the report.

FIFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report on the Symposium on Collective Bargaining in Industrialised Countries
(Vienna, 2-9 November 1977)

The Chairman observed that at its last session the Governing Body had adopted the proposal in paragraph 3 of the Office paper and that there was no other point for decision.

Mr. Bergenstrås (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed the Employers' satisfaction with the arrangements made for the Symposium and with the presentation of the report, which the meeting itself had adopted.

The Employers would prefer speakers to be identified, rather than that views should be attributed to unnamed "participants".

Mr. Nuhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) said that the Workers too were satisfied with the arrangements made for the Symposium and with its conclusions, which were useful.

The section of the report on collective bargaining in the context of inflation, recession and unemployment was especially welcome since it made the point that collective bargaining should be neither a substitute for economic policy nor a scapegoat for its shortcomings. International comparison showed that, whatever form it took, it was to blame neither for unemployment nor for inflation. Moreover, from the Workers' point of view collective agreements fixing wage and salary rates had the effect of freezing those rates for the period covered by the agreement while the employers could raise their prices, and therefore profits, at will.

The Workers had one reservation. They were sorry to see that in its discussion on collective bargaining as a means of regulating wages and working conditions - the subject mentioned in paragraph 5(b) - the Symposium had not dealt with the problem of ensuring equality of treatment for men and women workers, which, especially since International Women's Year, should be one of the ILO's abiding concerns.

According to paragraph 28 of the report it had been suggested that research was needed on the criteria governments should apply in deciding whether to refer "interest disputes" to compulsory arbitration. The Workers had serious misgivings about compulsory arbitration and trusted that the Office would carry out the research only after the matter had been discussed in the Governing Body; otherwise it might later give rise to dispute.

The Workers hoped that the report would be distributed as widely as possible, and particularly to public employees' unions, to which it would be no less interesting than to unions of workers in the private sector.

Mr. Inal (Government, Turkey), who had taken part in the meeting, felt that it had been worth while and stimulating. It had enabled people from government, employer, worker and academic circles to look at the main trends and problems of collective bargaining, and ways of promoting it, in countries with widely differing economic and social conditions. The Office had prepared useful material and the Austrian Government had provided excellent facilities.

The Turkish Government shared the view recorded in paragraph 31 of the report that such meetings were useful and that the ILO should hold more.
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Mr. Heldal (Government, Norway) welcomed the holding of the Symposium, which the Norwegian participants had found interesting and useful, and thanked the Austrian Government for its hospitality. The ILO should hold more meetings of that kind, although in future more time should be spent discussing common problems and less describing national systems, on which information was usually available anyway.

Mr. Ben Israel (Worker, Israel) felt that, although specific advice was better obtained from tripartite meetings, symposia served a useful purpose, and the paper which the Director-General was to prepare on such meetings would be welcome. They alerted public opinion to problems, paved the way for tripartite meetings and made for open debate in which university people too could take part; the latter in particular, though they should not of course have the last word on labour problems, could suggest new ideas and report on recent research.

One point already accepted at the World Employment Conference and driven home again at the Symposium was that the problem today was not to choose between inflation and unemployment but to fight both at the same time. Yet some governments and employers still seemed to consider unemployment as an economic tool for checking inflation.

Another important point brought out was that collective bargaining could prove helpful in times of economic recession, although of course the workers' representatives' main task should be to protect the workers' standard of living.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) demurred at Mr. Muhr's remark that management could set prices and profits as it pleased. In fact employers had to respect the rules of market competition as well as the terms of collective agreements, and that was why in some countries, as wages rose, firms might go bankrupt.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) felt that workers were losing faith in the market economy. According to market theory prices were supposed to rise and fall with demand, but they did not. For example, motor manufacturers in his own country had put prices up on the ground that, with demand and sales in decline, the cost of overheads for each unit sold was rising. And sometimes prices fell even when demand grew.

Mr. Robel (Worker, Madagascar) said that, while the Symposium had dealt usefully with the problems of industrialised countries, collective bargaining, which was one of the most effective ways of settling conditions of work and enhancing the workers' role in the undertaking, was a subject of keen interest to developing countries as well. Another meeting on the subject should be held for those countries, where industrial and working conditions were often rather different and workers' organisations weaker.

Mr. Melas (Government, Austria) expressed appreciation of the thanks offered to his Government, which was glad that the meeting had been such a success.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Meeting of Experts on Limits of Exposure to Dangerous Airborne Substances (Geneva, 21-28 November 1977)

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the Employers endorsed the proposal in paragraph 12 of the Office paper.

They felt, however, that the Code of Practice which the experts had adopted, and which was mentioned in paragraph 10, should not be published until wider consultations had been held with employers' circles and perhaps workers' circles as well.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the Workers' satisfaction with the results of the meeting, which they felt would afford guidance
in implementing the Working Environment (Air Pollution, Noise and Vibration) Convention and Recommendation adopted at the Conference in 1977, with regard to the monitoring of air pollution at the workplace. The experts' many unanimous conclusions should prove useful not only to the Office but also to member States, especially the Code of Practice, which should be sent to governments and employers' and workers' organisations as soon as possible.

One point brought out time and again in the report was the need to harmonise data systems and research methods so as to co-ordinate international research, thus lowering its cost, and remove the risk of variations in evaluation of the toxicity of substances.

The Workers supported the recommendations for action in paragraph 11 of the Office paper and the proposal in paragraph 12. For some time they had been advocating an international hazard alert system and they welcomed the relevant suggestions in paragraph 80 of the report. They also supported the recommendations for better medical facilities at the workplace and closer participation by workers in the prevention of air pollution and the proposals, set out in paragraphs 60 to 63 of the report, for setting exposure limits in developing countries: as was said in paragraph 62, foreign firms could set a good example.

Miss Caron (Government, Canada), though she had not seen the report before coming to Geneva and had not had time to consult the technical services in her country, found the experts' conclusions and recommendations invaluable and would have them brought to the attention of the federal and provincial authorities in Canada.

At present machinery was being set up in Canada for co-operation between those authorities in the complex area of occupational safety and health - and complex it was, because competence was divided not only between federal and provincial authorities but also between several federal departments and agencies. The Federal Government had just set up a national safety and health centre which was to gather and publish the latest information and would welcome guidance from international organisations like the ILO.

The Canadian Government was strongly in favour of establishing an international hazard alert system of the kind recommended in paragraph 79 of the experts' report and supported the relevant suggestions in paragraph 80, particularly the idea, recorded in subparagraph (i), of co-operation with the WHO and other international bodies.

It was disappointing to learn from paragraph 83 of the delay in revising the Encyclopaedia of Occupational Health and Safety. No doubt money was short, but still the Canadian Government shared the experts' hope that the work of revision would soon start.

It would be a good idea to adopt further standards on the working environment, as was suggested in paragraph 84, but what was needed was an instrument which would merely state the basic aims and principles of a coherent policy for controlling occupational hazards: one that sought also to "improve the working environment" and "adapt work to man" would probably be too wide in scope and too complex to secure many ratifications.

Lastly, the Canadian Government proposed that the Office should distribute the report and the technical papers presented at the meeting.

Miss González Martinez (Government, Mexico) said that her Government set great store by action to make the workplace safer and healthier, took a keen interest in the experts' conclusions and supported not only the proposal in paragraph 12 of the Office paper but also Ms. Caron's proposal for distributing the report.

Paragraphs 82 to 85 of the report contained some welcome suggestions and comments. The experts had, for example, recommended revising the list of occupational diseases appended to Convention No. 121, approved the Office's publications programme and advocated continuing to publish information according to the guidelines of PIACT, asked the Office to try to revise the Encyclopaedia of Occupational Health and Safety as soon as possible, and expressed the hope that budget cuts would not hold up work on the new edition of the Model Code of Safety Regulations for Industrial Establishments.
The Governing Body had not yet approved the programme reductions proposed by the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee. If it did, would the Director-General be able to take account of the experts' suggestions, as paragraph 12 of the Office paper proposed?

The Chairman said that there would be no objection to distributing the report, as Ms. Caron had proposed.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General), answering the question put by Miss González Martínez, observed that, although the Director-General would of course be bound by the Governing Body's decisions on the programme reductions proposed by the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee for the 1978-79 biennium, he could still take the experts' suggestions into account in making proposals for later years. Furthermore, there were useful steps recommended in the report which the Director-General could take even if the Governing Body approved the programme reductions, such as establishing the international hazard alert system.

As to Mr. Bergenström's point, there would be no difficulty in awaiting comments from employers and others before publishing the Code of Practice.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking for the Workers, trusted that publication of the Code would not be long delayed on that account. After all, the three sides had been represented at the meeting and there were no grounds for not having faith in what they had agreed on. If no comments were received within a reasonable time the Office should go ahead and publish the Code.

The Governing Body adopted the proposal in paragraph 12 of the Office paper and Ms. Caron's proposal for distribution of the report.

The sitting closed at 6:05 p.m.
FIFTH SITTING
(Wednesday, 1 March 1978, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.15 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Morris.

SEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Asian Advisory Committee on its Seventeenth Session (Manila, 29 November-8 December 1977)

Mr. Asfour (Employer, Jordan), who had been the Employer member of the Governing Body delegation to the Seventeenth Session of the Asian Advisory Committee, said that upwards of 50 participants had attended the session, in addition to some 20 representatives of other organisations and the members of the Governing Body Tripartite Evaluation Team to Bangladesh. The session had been opened by Mr. Joseph Morris, Chairman of the Governing Body, in the presence of Mr. Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Republic of the Philippines, of Mrs. Marcos, Governor of Metropolitan Manila and of the Director-General of the ILO. The secretariat had consisted of 53 ILO officials and local staff.

Mr. Blas Ople, Secretary of Labour of the Philippines, had proved a very able Chairman. There had, however, been some departures from normal ILO procedures which the Office should have advised against or on which the Governing Body delegation should have been consulted.

The four reports prepared by the Office had been highly appreciated, but the final report on the work of the Committee was too lengthy and, above all, very incomplete and unbalanced. It did, however, deal with the three agenda items and the final version took account of the corrections submitted by the participants.

The Tripartite Evaluation Team had been unable, for lack of time, to carry out its mandate entirely satisfactorily; it had, however, done very useful work, and the practice should be continued.

The discussion on standards had been dominated by the fact that, of all the continents, Asia had the lowest record of ratified Conventions; the Office statistics did not, of course, take account of China. The Employers and Workers had requested that in future ratification tables should indicate how governments had voted at the Conference on the standards, but the Office staff supported by certain governments had been opposed to that request and no decision had been taken.

More generally, emphasis had been laid on the need to strengthen tripartism and great care had been taken to avoid political speeches. On the whole the results were satisfactory, and the credit was largely due to the authorities and to the organisations of employers and workers of the Philippines.

Mr. de Alwis (Government, Sri Lanka), speaking as the Government member of the Governing Body delegation, thanked the Government of the Philippines for its hospitality, President and Mrs. Marcos for their attendance at the opening sitting, and the Director-General and his staff for their valuable contribution. He paid tribute to the memory of Mr. R.S. Oca, President of the Trade Union Congress of the Philippines, who had played an active part in the work of the Committee and whose untimely death had just become known.

This session of the Asian Advisory Committee, which was the first ILO meeting to be held after the departure of the United States, had shown how attached the countries of Asia were to the ILO. The discussions had been frank, realistic and constructive. Stress had been laid on the need to encourage technical co-operation by making greater use of national and regional experts, on the effectiveness of decentralisation accompanied by a strengthening of regional structures and on the need for greater involvement of both employers and workers in the preparation of programmes and projects.

With respect to standards, many suggestions had been made, particularly on how the Committee of Experts might hasten the process of ratification of Conventions and the application of standards in the economic and social context of the region.
With regard to the items proposed for the agenda of the Ninth Asian Regional Conference, these reflected the deep concern of members of the Committee with freedom of association, labour relations and development, and, in particular, the special emphasis placed on rural problems, land reform and income distribution.

Mr. Mayer (Worker, Austria), who had been the Worker member of the Governing Body delegation, endorsed the statements of his two colleagues. There had, in fact, been fruitful collaboration between the three groups and the results had been very satisfactory. He fully supported the various points mentioned in the report, and in particular the proposed agenda for the Ninth Asian Regional Conference. As for Mr. Asfour's remarks concerning departures from normal procedure, it should be pointed out that the matter had not actually been discussed in Manila.

The Government of the Philippines was to be thanked for its hospitality, together with the employers' and workers' organisations, which had done everything possible to help make the meeting a success.

Mr. Lee (Employer, Malaysia), who had been Chairman of the Employers' group at the meeting, said that he had greatly appreciated the warm welcome which the Committee had received in Manila. The presence of President and Mrs. Marcos had given added prestige to the meeting, which had operated very smoothly with the help of the secretariat under Mr. Ratnavale.

With regard to the evaluation of ILO activities in the Asian region, it had been strongly felt that the Organisation should continue to help the development of employers' organisations and participate in the promotion of management development. Only one government had expressed a contrary opinion - an attitude which was to be regretted since it could only weaken the cause of tripartism.

With regard to the second agenda item, it should be determined why Asia had registered so few ratifications. Clearly the Conventions and Recommendations were not always sufficiently realistic; modifying their aims and objectives somewhat would improve their chances of ratification by most member States and give them a truly universal dimension. China should be included in the statistics and information provided on the votes of governments at the Conference, as Mr. Asfour had requested; on the other hand, flexibility after ratification as suggested in paragraph 99 was not acceptable.

The members of the Bangladesh tripartite evaluation team should be thanked for the very considerable work they had done.

Finally, the proposed agenda for the Ninth Asian Regional Conference, which was the outcome of a compromise reached in the Committee, deserved support.

Mr. Azimi (Government, Iran) endorsed the remarks of the members who had thanked the host government for its hospitality. Despite a rather heavy agenda the Committee had held a useful exchange of views, and the Government of Iran supported the proposed agenda for the Ninth Asian Regional Conference.

Development and promotion of technical co-operation among Asian countries on labour matters was one of the items on the agenda of the Seventh Conference of Asian and Pacific Labour Ministers shortly to be held in New Zealand; but, as pointed out in paragraph 68 of the report, care would have to be taken to ensure that technical co-operation among developing countries did not duplicate work done under other regional projects.

Mr. Mehta (Worker, India) associated himself with the thanks expressed to the authorities and to the employers' and workers' organisations of the Philippines; he also deplored the sudden passing of the President of the Trade Union Congress of the Philippines, Mr. Oca.

He drew attention to various views expressed by the Workers' group as recorded in the report, and, in particular, the need for a considerable improvement of consultations at the national level, the need for the ILO to do more for workers' education by way of direct funding and the need to explore the question of the migration of skilled and semi-skilled workers from Asian countries to the Middle East.

With regard to standards, the workers attached less importance to the formal ratification of Conventions than to their implementation since, in certain
countries, the spirit of an unratified Convention might be respected while in others
Conventions which had been ratified were not respected. In any event, the reasons
why ratifications were so few in Asia should also be explored, since the obstacles
were often mere technical ones which could easily be overcome.

The Workers attached great importance to tripartite evaluation missions such
as that which had gone to Bangladesh. In future, such missions should be even more
carefully prepared so that they could throw more light on the problems of the
region.

The preparation of reports for the Asian Regional Conference should receive
close attention, and they should be made available as soon as possible.

After thanking the Chairman and the Governing Body members who had been
present in Manila, he paid tribute to the efficiency of the Executive Secretary, Mr.
Batnavale, and on behalf of his group wished him well in his retirement.

Mr. Ghayour (Employer, Iran) considered that the meeting had been very well
prepared. He appreciated having received the reports well in advance so that he
could study them carefully and he paid tribute to Mr. Ople's effectiveness as
Chairman.

The study and evaluation of ILO activities in Asia was an interesting subject
to which closer attention should be paid in future. The limited number of
ratifications in Asia derived from the lack of flexibility of the instruments, but
these obstacles were not insurmountable and, to eliminate them, a tripartite
committee should be set up in each country which would concern itself with the
ratification of ILO instruments. The proposed agenda of the Ninth Asian Regional
Conference had been arrived at by combining several of the subjects proposed, and
that approach should prove satisfactory.

The meeting had drawn considerable lustre from the presence of Mr. Morris, Mr.
Blanchard and Mr. Jain, who deserved congratulations and thanks.

Mr. Basri (Government, Indonesia) warmly thanked President and Mrs. Marcos for
the arrangements they had made to make the meeting a success. He congratulated Mr.
Blas Ople on his able chairmanship and paid tribute to the efficiency of the
secretariat, thanks to which the meeting had run smoothly.

As to the many questions which had been dealt with in Manila, he hoped that
the ILO would give them the required attention and that the conclusions adopted
would be reflected in projects and programmes which would help to solve the manpower
problems of Asia.

On page 36 of the report, in the paragraph which concerned Indonesia, the
title "Director-General, Labour Protection and Welfare" should be replaced by
"Director-General, Labour Protection and Maintenance" and the term "Department of
Manpower, Transportation and Co-operatives" should be replaced by "Department of
Manpower, Transmigration and Co-operatives".

Mr. Raghupathi (Government, India) associated himself with the members who had
thanked the Government of the Philippines for its cordial welcome and the
organisations of employers and workers for their hospitality. The Asian Advisory
Committee had done good work and had made useful recommendations on subjects diverse
but also significant, such as technical co-operation, decentralisation, tripartism,
employment generation and skill development.

The Director-General had pointed out that over 850 million people were living
in Asia in dire poverty and that 186 million were unemployed or chronically
underemployed and that, by the end of the century, the labour force would have
doubled. This was a real challenge to the world community, and in particular to the
ILO, which was based on the principles of social justice and humanity. Technical
co-operation might not be the definitive answer to the problems of Asian countries
which continued to be the victims of an inequitable international economic order,
but it might serve to alleviate the situation provided it was increased and
reoriented. For instance, less emphasis should be laid on the urban sector and more
on the rural sector; there should be less reliance on outside experts, who were
very costly, and more on direct assistance for projects which would generate
employment and have a multiplier effect.
Apart from their human resources, the Asian countries had many natural resources and their economies were complementary in many respects. Regional co-operation was needed and India, for its part, was ready to place experts at the disposal of the region. In fact, a regional team of experts had already assessed the capacities and needs of the various Asian countries and identified the institutions which could help them. It was to be hoped that the technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC) project formulated by the ILO in consultation with the UNDP would take account of all these aspects and that it would be backed by a larger financial outlay.

Standards were the best instruments for promoting human rights and social justice, but the sole beneficiaries were those who had succeeded in finding employment, to the exclusion of the great majority of the labour force who were looking for jobs and struggling for mere survival. This was not to minimise the importance of standards, and in India there was a tripartite committee which was seeking ways of implementing as many provisions as possible of Conventions which it had not proved possible to ratify for various reasons. As to those cases in which ratification had proved possible, mention might be made of Convention No. 144, for which India had just deposited the required instrument.

The results of the Asian Advisory Committee were on the whole satisfactory. The meeting had provided a fresh insight into what should be done both at the national level and at the ILO level, and the Committee had proposed for the Ninth Asian Regional Conference an agenda which could readily be recommended for adoption.

Mr. Sudono (Worker, Indonesia) also thanked the Philippine Government for its hospitality; he congratulated Mr. Mendoza, who had been Worker Vice-Chairman of the Committee, and Mr. Menta, whom the Worker members had elected Chairman of their group, for their active and effective participation. Of all meetings of the Asian Advisory Committee held to date the Seventeenth Session had been one of the most successful.

With regard to the first item on the agenda, the share of technical assistance funds allocated to the Asian region should be increased. Governments should be urged to give higher priority to projects in the labour and social fields and, in their national development plans, to pay particular attention to the basic needs of low-income groups in the rural areas. In all such plans the cost of experts was unduly high and, with a view to reducing it, training should be provided for citizens of Asian countries, for example by means of appropriate grants to workers' organisations. Expert missions should be prepared more carefully, both by the countries concerned and by the ILO, with greater emphasis on tripartism. With regard to technical co-operation between developing countries (TCDC), greater use should be made of experts from developing countries, first because they were attuned and had a lifetime of exposure to development problems, secondly because of their vast experience in that area, and lastly because they were relatively cheaper. Tripartism should be promoted by associating employers' and workers' organisations in the planning and implementation of regional projects; this presupposed that governments had ratified Convention No. 144 and taken the necessary steps to make it effective.

With regard to the second item on the agenda, it should be strongly emphasised that standards were the guidelines for the promotion of human rights, the satisfaction of basic needs and the establishment of social progress. Governments should set up, within their labour ministries, a special unit with the responsibility of promoting ratification of ILO standards and following up their implementation by means of direct contacts and tripartite consultation.

Mr. Ahmed (Worker, Pakistan) thanked the Government and the employers' and workers' organisations of the Philippines for their generous hospitality and, after paying tribute to the memory of Mr. Oca, expressed high appreciation of the presence in Manila of the Chairman of the Governing Body, the Government Body delegation and the Director-General.

The Director-General had spoken of poverty in Asia and expressed his conviction that the ILO, as an organisation with a social purpose, had a major part to play in improving conditions of work and life. That, indeed, was the very object of standards. It was to be hoped that the recommendations in the report would be implemented and that, in the studies carried out for the next Asian Regional Conference, full account would be taken of all the problems now facing Asia - in particular, freedom of association and labour relations, rural workers and agrarian reforms, unemployment and underemployment, income distribution and social progress.
He approved the recommendations in paragraph 24 of the report concerning technical co-operation, particularly with respect to skill development, and those in paragraph 53 which rightly stressed the part which ARSDEP could play in that field. Tripartism should also be strengthened and, to that end, efforts made to encourage more countries to ratify Convention No. 144. The inadequacy of ratifications in Asia had been pointed out and, along the lines mentioned in paragraph 110, steps should be taken to promote ratification particularly of Conventions Nos. 87, 98, 129 and 141.

Finally, the Report of the Director-General to the Asian Regional Conference should include a review of the implementation of standards, as suggested in paragraph 123.

Mr. Zaidi (Worker, Malaysia) supported the statements made by Mr. Mehta, Mr. Maier, Mr. Sudono and Mr. Ahmed.

He expressed his appreciation of the way in which the members of the Tripartite Evaluation Team had been prepared for their mission to Bangladesh and the quality of the documentation with which they had been supplied. The object had been to evaluate ILO programmes in the region, and the team had done everything it could in the limited time available; in so doing it had received valuable help from the local authorities. The usefulness of such missions had already been demonstrated and their number should be increased since they provided a means for studying problems on the spot and establishing direct contacts with those concerned. They also helped to make ILO activities better known. These did not always receive proper publicity since regional representatives and the staff of field offices often lacked sufficient funds. The mission to Bangladesh should now be followed up and, as was being proposed, form the subject of an item on the agenda of the Committee on Operational Programmes.

Regarding the work of the Asian Advisory Committee, everyone knew that Asia had a very large population, but it was less well known that the number of people who were members of an employers' or workers' organisation was relatively low, for there were not many countries in which freedom of association was respected. That was why the Asian Advisory Committee had felt that freedom of association, labour relations and development in Asia should be placed on the agenda of the next Regional Conference. Such subjects, however, could not be studied in the abstract on the basis of mere printed legal documentation. On-the-spot inquiries were needed, and for that purpose missions made up of ILO officials and members of the Governing Body might go to each country to assess the implementation of ratified Conventions, to discover the reasons why other Conventions had not been ratified and, in general, to make suggestions aimed at removing the difficulties.

In concluding, he associated himself with the tribute to Mr. Ratnavale, a tireless worker to whom a great part of the success of the meeting was owed and to whom he wished a well-earned rest on the occasion of his forthcoming retirement.

Mr. Iwata (Government, Japan) associated himself with the thanks expressed to the Government of the Philippines for its warm hospitality. The material prepared by the Office had been excellent and rightly stressed the importance of social problems in Asia, particularly in rural areas. The discussions in the Committee had suggested means whereby the ILO could help the Asian countries to co-operate with one another towards solving their problems. Japan attached the greatest importance to the Organisation's Asian activities, particularly those concerned with technical co-operation.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany), referring to the mission to Bangladesh in which the Governing Body had appointed him to participate, thanked the government officials and the employers' and workers' representatives of Bangladesh who had devoted a great deal of their time to the members of the evaluation team and expressed themselves very candidly. The help and friendship of Mr. Majumdar of the Ministry of Labour had been especially valuable.

Missions of this kind were extremely useful, as technical co-operation problems could not merely be discussed across a table but had to be studied on the spot. In the present instance the team had been very well composed: it had been tripartite and had included representatives of the three major regions and of both industrialised countries and developing countries, among whose co-operation had been excellent.
There had been some criticism regarding preparations for the evaluation mission. These had in fact been excellent, and it was mainly the timetable which left room for improvement; that question might be re-examined in November. Meanwhile, warm thanks were due to all the ILO officials who had helped to make the mission a success.

It was, indeed, impossible to carry out a true evaluation, and even if the time available to the team were tripled it would be impossible to carry out a full and perfect evaluation of technical co-operation activities. Only impressions could be gathered, and in this case they had been good impressions. The thanks expressed to the Government of Bangladesh should go also to that of the Philippines for the hospitality extended to the team in Manila following its mission.

That said, it was a fair question whether the rather high cost of a meeting such as that just held was really commensurate with the results achieved.

Ms. Caron (Government, Canada) said that her Government appreciated how difficult it was for developing countries to ratify and implement standards adopted for the most part before they had joined the Organisation. Some adaptation of the system seemed to be called for, and in that regard direct contacts and informal consultations could play an important part towards smoothing the difficulties, or at least some of them.

So far, however, as the universality of standards was concerned, there could be no double standard: criteria for assessing the implementation of ratified instruments should be the same for all, particularly with regard to the basic instruments on human rights. It was another matter when standards were being drawn up: that was the stage at which careful consideration might be given to the possible implications of draft instruments for member States, and the required flexibility applied where necessary so that the instruments could be ratified and, above all, implemented as widely as possible. The Working Party on International Labour Standards should give early attention to this matter, as was suggested in paragraph 107(c) of the report.

Mr. Ahmed (Employer, Sudan), speaking as the Employer member of the Bangladesh evaluation team, drew attention to paragraphs 56 and 62 of the report, which highlighted the importance of tripartite evaluation missions and the need to continue them in the interest of governments and employers' and workers' organisations. The Asian Advisory Committee had in fact based its conclusions on technical co-operation, as given in paragraph 63 and the following paragraphs of its report, on the comments of the Bangladesh team. As the team's report would be submitted to the Committee on Operational Programmes in November, it need only be pointed out at this stage that the tripartite component originally lacking in the programme for Bangladesh had been introduced in 1976 thanks to the introduction of consultative machinery on the initiative of the ILO office in Dacca. That initiative should be given official recognition and developed. The Organisation should also accelerate programmes now under way, particularly those with social objectives.

Thanks were due to the Government of Bangladesh, to the employers' and workers' organisations of that country and to the ILO office in Dacca, as well as to the Government and employers' and workers' organisations of the Philippines for their hospitality.

Mr. Mendoza (Worker, Philippines) was pleased that the participants in the Asian Advisory Committee meeting had enjoyed their stay in Manila. His country had been very happy to welcome them, and he expressed appreciation to all those who had taken part in the session, starting with the Chairman of the Governing Body and the Director-General, and not forgetting Mr. Ratnavale and all the members of the secretariat for their valuable contribution towards making the meeting a success. On behalf of the Trade Union Congress of the Philippines he thanked those who had expressed their sympathy on the death of Roberto S. Oca, an active participant in ILO activities for over 25 years.

In the past the people of the Philippines had not properly understood the role of the ILO, but after the Manila meeting they were much better informed and able to appreciate all that the Organisation was doing, not only in the Philippines and in Asia but throughout the world, to improve the living and working conditions of workers. He hoped that the conclusions and recommendations in the report would be duly followed up and that the documents for the next Asian Regional Conference would be prepared early so that they could be properly studied and lead to fruitful discussions.
Mr. Rentraao (Government, Thailand) thanked the Government of the Philippines, the employers’ and workers’ organisations and also the University of the Philippines for their warm hospitality. Having associated himself with the tributes to Mr. Oca’s memory, he commended Mr. Ople on the manner in which he had conducted the Committee’s work and the Executive Secretary, Mr. Eatnavale, to whom he wished happiness in his retirement.

It was most gratifying that senior officials from the International Labour Standards Department had come out this time to gain first-hand knowledge of the difficulties encountered by Asian countries in ratifying and applying standards. This practice should be continued, as one way of bridging the gap in understanding which sometimes existed between the Organisation and its member States. The Government of Thailand gave its unqualified support to the Committee’s conclusions and endorsed the recommendations in the Office paper.

Mr. Tata (Employer, India) said that, if tripartism was not what it should be in Asia, that was because trade unions were either non-existent or too many and also because employers’ organisations lacked the necessary resources. To remedy this workers’ education programmes should be intensified, and the ILO was quite rightly taking steps in that direction, but the employers’ organisations also needed help since they were often less developed than the trade unions. The ILO had made worthy efforts in that area and those efforts should be continued, whether certain countries liked it or not, since collective bargaining could take place only between responsible organisations.

Tripartite consultation should also be developed in Asia. As Mr. Mehta had rightly said, some countries applied the spirit of ILO Conventions even if for technical reasons they had not ratified them, while others were quick to ratify Conventions but afterwards simply forgot them. In India, which had just ratified Convention No. 144, a committee through which employers’ and workers’ organisations were regularly consulted had existed for over ten years. The strengthening of tripartism in Asia met a real need since it was a guarantee of political stability and respect for the lofty principles which the ILO stood for.

In embarking upon a rural employment programme the Organisation had broadened its horizon. In the longer term its contribution in that area could prove extremely rewarding in promoting social justice. There were millions of rural workers who were in a far worse position than industrial workers, and it was high time that the ILO concerned itself with their problems. Rural development should be given the same priority as industrial development, and skill development should receive due attention in that framework. That would meet a wish expressed by the World Employment Conference, and it was to be hoped that the UNDP would provide funds to help the ILO in that field.

In future technical assistance programmes, notably in the area of training, greater emphasis should be laid on self-employment. In Asia industry was not likely to develop all that fast, and even labour-intensive processes could not provide new jobs on a massive scale, but there was wide scope for self-employment.

Those who criticised the ILO whenever something was not perfect should remember that very often the fault lay with member States themselves, who paid little attention to the ILO’s recommendations and principles. Asia was a gigantic mirror in which the social conscience of the ILO could be reflected, and the misery that existed there on such a vast scale offered it a challenge which, if successfully met, would earn for it the respect of the entire world.

Mr. Fogarty (Government, Australia) supported the recommendations in the report. He associated himself with those who had expressed appreciation of the facilities placed at the Committee’s disposal and of the hospitality extended to the participants by the Philippine Government and employers’ and workers’ organisations. He fully shared the views expressed by Ms. Caron on international labour standards.

On behalf of the Asian governments, he thanked Mr. Eatnavale for his valuable work over the years and offered them their best wishes in his retirement.

Mr. Hashbei (Government, Pakistan), after expressing appreciation to the Philippine Government for its hospitality and the secretariat for the quality of its work, said that, as the Director-General had rightly pointed out, Asia was the continent with the greatest number of unemployed. This fact alone was ground for asking the ILO to increase the resources available for direct advisory services in Asia, which contributed substantially towards meeting technical assistance needs.
Since the greater part of the population in developing countries lived in rural areas the Organisation should give priority to that sector and undertake research and action programmes geared especially to the problems of rural workers.

With regard to vocational training, the Government of Pakistan had already expressed its views on the effectiveness and usefulness of ILO vocational training projects, and it reaffirmed its readiness to welcome AESDEP to Pakistan.

The Director-General paid tribute to the memory of Roberto Oca, the news of whose death had caused great sorrow. In his own name and on behalf of the Office, he requested Mr. Mendoza to convey his sympathy to Mr. Oca's family and to the Trade Union Congress of the Philippines.

Like others he wished to express warm thanks to the Government of the Philippines, and his thanks went especially to President and Mrs. Marcos, who had done the Committee the honour of attending the opening sitting, as well as to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Bias Ople, who had devoted a great deal of energy, imagination and kindness to making the participants' task easier and the meeting a success. As an official guest of President Marcos, he had been deeply touched by the generous hospitality extended to him.

As the official in charge of the meeting, he wished to pay tribute to the highly effective way in which Mr. Jain and his secretariat had helped him. Mr. Ratnavale, in particular, had no doubt listened with pleasure to the remarks made concerning him. As Director-General he associated himself with those remarks and thanked Mr. Ratnavale for the care he had taken in preparing this and so many other meetings and wished him happiness in his coming retirement.

The number and tenor of the statements made in the discussion showed how useful the meeting was generally considered to have been. Emphasis had rightly been laid not only on the outstandingly good working conditions in Manila, but also on the quality of the discussions and the responsible manner in which the governments, employers and workers gathered there had approached their task.

The debate on technical co-operation had been particularly useful; in that regard, Mr. Tata and others had done well to stress the importance of rural development. In particular, a very interesting discussion had taken place on technical co-operation among developing countries (TCDC), and the Asian Advisory Committee meeting had, in that respect, been an excellent prelude to the conference due to be held in Buenos Aires in 1979 to explore the prospects opened up by that new form of co-operation.

The ratification and implementation of standards took up considerable space in the report, which dealt clearly and candidly with the full range of problems associated with the setting and application of international labour standards.

The work of the Asian Advisory Committee had effectively laid the groundwork for the next Asian Regional Conference due to be held in 1980. In line with the policy of decentralisation the Bangkok Office would undoubtedly have a very important part to play in preparation for the Conference.

The members of the Bangladesh evaluation team should be thanked for the considerable work they had done, and the Government of Bangladesh for the facilities placed at their disposal. Following the missions to Ghana and Colombia the mission to Bangladesh was the third of its kind, so that all three regions had now been covered. The time had come to draw the lessons from this experiment undertaken on the initiative of the Governing Body itself. In November the Committee on Operational Programmes would consider the need for and desirability of such missions, including the question whether they should be organised immediately before regional committee sessions, having regard to the perhaps undesirable element of haste which that practice entailed.

The office had taken due note of the very substantial discussion which had just taken place and would take full advantage of what had been said as well as of the conclusions of the Manila meeting.

The Chairman echoed the sentiments just expressed. The facilities provided for the Committee had been very good, the preparatory work done by Mr. Ratnavale and the secretariat excellent, and the meeting had been highly successful. The report gave an idea of the work accomplished and reflected the sincerity and honesty of the discussions held between the three groups.
He associated himself with the tributes to the memory of Mr. Oca, President of the Trade Union Congress of the Philippines and a long-time friend, and with the well-deserved thanks expressed to the Government and to the employers' and workers' organisations of the Philippines.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 of the Office paper.

EIGHTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee appointed by the Governing Body to consider the representation presented by the World Federation of Trade Unions under Article 24 of the Constitution alleging non-observance of the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) by the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Denmark

Mr. Griffin (Government, Venezuela), speaking as Chairman of the Committee appointed by the Governing Body to consider the representation submitted by the World Confederation of Trade Unions, introduced the Committee's report.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

NINTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee appointed by the Governing Body to consider the representation of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions under Article 24 of the Constitution alleging non-observance of the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) by Czechoslovakia

Mr. Griffin (Government, Venezuela), speaking as Chairman of the Committee appointed by the Governing Body to consider the representation submitted by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, said that the Committee was at present examining this question and that, at the appropriate moment, he would submit a report to the Governing Body.

The sitting closed at 12.55 p.m.
VI/1

SIXTH SITTING
(Wednesday, 1 March 1978, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.20 p.m., under the chairmanship of Mr. Morris.

TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy: possibilities of a follow-up procedure

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) said that the Workers' group thought it urgently necessary to adopt a procedure for follow-up of the Tripartite Declaration of Principles. Those who had attended the Tripartite Advisory Meeting on the Relationship of Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy were sorry that the Governing Body had not established such a procedure when it had adopted the Declaration at its November 1977 session. The Declaration would clearly remain a dead letter if nothing was done to ensure some sort of follow-up and, although it was not binding, the procedure should be such as to show how far it was being applied and should include provision for investigation of particular cases.

The existing constitutional and other procedures should be applied as far as possible to the Declaration, as was suggested in paragraphs 2 to 4 of the Office paper. The reports on the effect given to the Declaration, mentioned in paragraph 5, should be based on questionnaires like those used for supervising the application of ratified instruments.

Regarding the questions raised in paragraph 7, the Worker members considered that reports should be requested both from the home countries of multinational enterprises and from the host countries, and that the system of reporting should be based on Article 23, paragraph 2 of the Constitution. The constitutional system had been so well developed over the years that not only did employers' and workers' organisations now send comments to governments but international occupational organisations, too, could address observations directly to the Office. The system applicable to Industrial Committees, on the other hand, had not proved so effective and should not be adopted in this case.

According to the recommendation in paragraph 9 two years were to elapse before the first reports fell due. The Workers' group would have preferred one year only, but since time had already passed since the adoption of the Declaration and governments would need time to report, the Workers could agree to a two-year deadline in this case, although they hoped that consideration would be given to reducing it later to one year.

As to the consideration of the reports on the effect given to the Declaration, referred to in paragraphs 10 to 13 of the paper, the Workers felt that it should be entrusted to a subcommittee of the Governing Body and hoped that the Director-General would submit proposals to the Governing Body to that effect in November 1978, rather than in March 1979 as proposed in paragraph 13.

Mr. Nair (Government, India) thought it a great achievement for the ILO to have adopted the Tripartite Declaration of Principles before the United Nations had adopted its International Code of Conduct for Transnational Corporations.

Because the Declaration was not binding a suitable follow-up procedure had to be devised. The existing constitutional procedures were not directly applicable, and it was therefore vital to develop a separate and effective reporting system. The Indian Government endorsed the recommendation in paragraph 9 of the paper and hoped that multinational enterprises would let governments have the information they needed for their reports in good time.

Regarding the body to be entrusted with the consideration of reports, and the question of its composition, what really mattered was that it should enjoy the confidence of those concerned. The Governing Body need not decide the matter until
March 1979, as was proposed in paragraph 13 of the Office paper. In making his proposals the Director-General should remember that the first reports, due at the end of 1979, could be considered by the Tripartite Advisory Meeting to be convened in 1979. As the author of the Declaration the Meeting was fully suited for that task and it might also say what kind of body should be set up to consider the later reports.

After consideration of the first reports it might prove necessary, as was suggested in paragraph 14, to introduce conciliation and fact-finding procedures for certain cases of non-observance. Here again it would be useful for the Governing Body to seek the views of the Tripartite Advisory Meeting.

In that connection, and as regards subparagraph 15(a) in particular, it should be understood that any international jurisdiction which would come into play when available national means of settlement had been exhausted would have to be freely accepted by all the States concerned.

Mr. Coates (Employer, United Kingdom), speaking for the Employers, observed that the Governing Body was being asked to take the further action needed to make the Declaration effective, with due regard to existing ILO procedures—for example for considering complaints of violations of trade union rights—and to national arrangements relating to industrial relations and the settlement of disputes. To avoid giving the Declaration the status of a legal document a clear distinction should be drawn between the new procedures proposed and existing procedures which might be relevant to multinational as well as national enterprises. The Employers therefore supported the recommendation in paragraph 9 for a separate procedure.

It was reasonable for the ILO to ask for reports after two years, since by then enough experience would have been gained. As, however, the Declaration had not been sent to governments until 26 January 1978, it would be preferable to ask them to report at the beginning of 1980 rather than at the end of 1979. It was vital that responsibility for drawing up the reports should rest with governments, either of host countries or of home countries.

As regards a procedure whereby international organisations might report directly to the ILO, the Employers would have no objections, at least so far as international organisations with consultative status were concerned. The Office should not, however, let the practice get out of hand; if it did, more information would accumulate than could be assessed and compared.

Since the questionnaire was to relate to a non-mandatory text, it should avoid using hostile language which might be taken amiss. It would probably be useful for the Office to consult the Employers and the Workers on the form of the questionnaire.

As was said in paragraph 11 of the Office paper, the purpose of consideration of the reports to be received in two years' time should be to determine the degree of acceptance of the terms of the Declaration, patterns of action to give effect to it and possible difficulties and inadequacies. The system might be reviewed in the light of the experience gained in the first two years.

Some members of the other groups were concerned about the behaviour of particular multinational enterprises and would like to see the procedure strengthened. The Employers thought that it would be a mistake to ask for reports on particular cases because those cases fell in the first instance within the competence of the governments concerned. Thought should be given to establishing a fact-finding procedure only if at the end of two years special measures proved necessary.

As regards the composition of the body which would consider the reports, the Employers favoured a tripartite formula like the one approved for the Tripartite Advisory Meeting, whose work had led to consensus in the Governing Body. The Governing Body should therefore appoint a group of experts, but not from among its own members. Other solutions might be considered in March 1979 when the matter again came up on the Governing Body’s agenda. The Employers thought that it would be unwise to take a hasty decision.

Mr. Iwata (Government, Japan) set great store by a follow-up procedure and stressed the following points: first, that since it had been agreed that the Declaration should not be binding the parties concerned should not be under a legal
obligation to report; secondly, that the reports should be concerned only with the
main provisions of the Declaration and that the questionnaire should not go into too
much detail; and, thirdly, that given the state of the ILO's finances the body set
up to examine reports should be as small as possible.

Mr. Castellanos (Government, Venezuela) pointed out that the United Nations
and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) used the term
"transnational corporations" to describe what the ILO called "multinational
enterprises". That was bound to cause misunderstanding. Moreover, in Latin America
the term "multinationals" had special political, social and economic connotations.
The Office should therefore make it quite clear by means of footnotes in any
material which it published on the subject that by "multinational enterprises" it
meant what were called "transnational corporations" in the United Nations and
elsewhere.

Mrs. González Martínez (Government, Mexico) endorsed Mr. Castellanos's remarks
and asked the Office to include in any future issue of the text of the Tripartite
Declaration of Principles a footnote explaining to the lay reader how the ILO
defined "multinational enterprises". In Latin America the term meant
intergovernmental enterprises set up by the authorities of several countries in
certain fields.

Regarding Part II of the Office paper, she feared that the Office might find
it very difficult to give the Governing Body adequate information on the effect
given to the Declaration, since it had been approved only by the Governing Body and
many countries which were not represented on the Governing Body might not feel bound
to give it effect.

In connection with paragraph 7(a) of the paper, it would be desirable, from
the point of view both of the Office and of member States, to obtain information
from governments of host as well as home countries, including those which were both
home and host countries.

The proposed establishment of a reporting system comparable to the
constitutional procedure for the application of international labour standards might
prove difficult since the Declaration was not binding. That weakness, indeed,
detracted in large part from its value and constituted a bad precedent in relation
to current work in the United Nations on an International Code of Conduct for Trans­
national Corporations.

It was of course desirable to find out how far the terms of the Declaration
were accepted by ILO member States, but that should not entail setting up a system
identical to that governing reports under Articles 19 and 22 of the Constitution.
To avoid any confusion between the two procedures it would be necessary at least to
replace, in the Spanish text of paragraph 9 of the Office paper, the words "una
primera memoria" by "un primer informe", the term "memoria" being reserved for the
procedure for supervising the application of instruments approved at the Conference
by the whole ILO membership.

The Mexican Government endorsed the suggestion in paragraph 13 of the Office
paper. The proposals in question regarding various formulae for the composition of
a body to consider the reports might be considered by the Tripartite Advisory
Meeting due to be held at the end of 1979 or the beginning of 1980.

As regards the consideration of particular cases, the procedures outlined in
paragraph 14 gave grounds for misgivings; the principles underlying those procedures
should first be accepted by the ILO's whole membership.

There was no real parallel between the International Code of Conduct under
preparation in the United Nations and the ILO Declaration. Unlike the Declaration
the Code was intended to be a contractual instrument. If the Declaration was to
have the same legal force and binding character as the Universal Declaration of
Human Rights it would have to be submitted to all ILO member States for approval.

Mr. González Izquierdo (Government, Cuba) joined the Government
representatives of Venezuela and Mexico in asking the Office to define the terms
"transnational corporations" and "multinational enterprises", since the latter had a
special meaning in Latin America. Had the Declaration been put to the ILO's whole
membership for approval it would probably have been a more detailed and more
effective text.
Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) said that the Worker members did not care which of the terms was used provided it was clearly understood to refer to the same kind of enterprises or corporations.

The Chairman said that the change proposed by Miss González Martínez would be made in the Spanish text of paragraph 9 of the Office paper.

On that understanding, the Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 9 of the Office paper.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria), referring to the recommendation in paragraph 13, reminded the Governing Body of the Workers' request that the November 1978 session should be the one at which the Governing Body would receive proposals for the composition and terms of reference of the body which was to consider reports.

Mr. Coates (Employer, United Kingdom), for the Employers, objected that the Governing Body would hardly have time to think the matter over and give proper instructions to the Director-General before March 1979.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria), without wishing to press the Workers' proposal, observed that the Director-General's paper would in fact relate only to possible formulae for the composition of the body which was to consider reports. Surely the Governing Body would need much time to reflect on such a purely procedural matter.

Mr. Coates (Employer, United Kingdom) concurred, provided that only procedural proposals were to be made and there was no question of bringing forward the date for submitting reports or for discussing proposals for a procedure for particular cases.

The Chairman asked the Governing Body whether it agreed to invite the Director-General to submit the proposals to it in November 1978.

It was so agreed.

The Governing Body adopted the proposal in paragraph 13 of the Office paper, as amended.

(A statement by the representative of the World Confederation of Labour was circulated in connection with this agenda item.)

THIRTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Allocations Committee

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) observed that the section of the report on the position of member States which did not participate actively in the work of the Organisation referred in fact, though not by name, to China, the only country which met the three criteria set out in paragraph 5. The Employers were sorry to see that it was the Allocations Committee, a purely governmental body, which had considered the matter, and not the tripartite Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee. They could accept the recommendation in paragraph 6 but wished to put it clearly on record that they found China's attitude unacceptable. It was deplorable that nothing in the Constitution required inactive Members to leave.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 6, 7 and 10 of the report.

SIXTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Industrial Activities Committee

Mr. Richan (Employer, Canada), who in the absence of Mr. Haase had taken the chair, introduced the Committee's report.
The Committee's discussions on the three items of its agenda had been marked by a spirit of co-operation and mutual understanding. As to the first item, the Committee had recommended the order of priority set out in paragraph 28 of the report for the reduced programme of industrial meetings for 1978-79. It had also recommended that no change should be made for the time being in the composition of delegations to such meetings (2-2-2), but that corresponding savings should be made, preferably by reducing the number of industrial meetings scheduled.


Discussion on the third item - the report of the Tripartite Meeting on Conditions of Work and Employment of Professional Workers - had revealed some irregularities in the way in which the Office had prepared and distributed the main paper for that meeting. The Director-General would, it was to be hoped, ensure that such irregularities did not recur.

Mr. Huhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) endorsed Mr. Richan's remarks. The Workers were glad to see that the Committee had unanimously decided against recommending any change in the composition of delegations to Industrial Committees and analogous meetings. The quality of the Committees' work would have suffered severely from any reduction in the number of participants such as had been proposed at the Governing Body's November 1977 session.

Because of the present financial difficulties the Committee had reluctantly had to make the other two recommendations, the purpose of which was to reduce the frequency of meetings, even though in the past it had always stressed the need to shorten the intervals between sessions. The Worker members regarded what was proposed as emergency measures which should not continue once the financial crisis was over. They had urged in the Committee, and they urged again in the Governing Body, that on no account should the Director-General reduce the staff of the Industrial Sectors Branch, which had already had difficulty in finding qualified people.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the Employers' support for the recommendations in paragraphs 11, 28 and 30 of the report and shared the Workers' hope that soon industrial meetings would be just as frequent as before.

The Employers members had said in the Committee, and wished to repeat, that they would like the Meeting of Experts on Problems of Foreign Construction Workers Employed in European Countries to be held over to the end of 1979. Having held consultations, however, they withdrew the reservations they had expressed in the Committee about postponing the Second Tripartite Technical Meeting for the Food Products and Drink Industries to October 1978.

The Employers supported the recommendations in paragraph 42 of the report regarding follow-up of the Meeting of Experts on Safety Problems in the Construction and Operation of Offshore Drilling Installations in the Petroleum Industry.

Views had differed in the Committee on the report of the Tripartite Meeting on Conditions of Work and Employment of Professional Workers. The Employers would prefer the compendium of principles and good practices mentioned in the report not to be distributed until everyone concerned had had a chance to comment. They did not feel that the meeting had been representative enough to draw up a compendium of good practices for general use. Publication should be delayed for three months so that other opinions could be obtained.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) observed that she had asked the Committee not to postpone the Ninth Session of the Petroleum Committee. Her Government put great stock in the work of that Committee because of the rapid technical developments in the petroleum industry and consequent new hazards, which called for measures to protect the workers.

Mr. Richan (Employer, Canada) drew attention to paragraph 28 of the report according to which the session of the Petroleum Committee was in principle to be one of the first two meetings held in 1980.

Mr. Huhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking for the Workers, explained that it had been found possible to postpone the Ninth Session of the
Petroleum Committee to the end of 1979 or the beginning of 1980 because the Meeting of Experts on Safety Problems in the Construction and Operation of Offshore Drilling Installations in the Petroleum Industry had been held in October 1977. The report of that meeting of experts and the proposed preparation of a code of safety practice for the industry would serve to meet the wish expressed by Miss González Martinez. The Committee was not empowered to make express recommendations for meetings for the next biennium, particularly since membership of the Governing Body was shortly to be renewed. The Workers' group nevertheless hoped that the Petroleum Committee would meet as soon as possible.

As to alleged irregularities in the distribution of the report for the Tripartite Meeting on Conditions of Work and Employment of Professional Borkers, it should be pointed out that the Office had sent the report to an outside organisation only because the Office had been unable to translate it into German. That had been necessary because the intention had been to appoint a German-speaking delegate as Chairman of the Workers' group. The Office could not therefore be accused of acting improperly in having the translation done by the organisation in question, which had done the work free of charge.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) said that the fact remained that one of the parties had seen the report several weeks before the others.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria), referring to the Employers' suggestion that publication of the compendium of good practices should be postponed for three months, said that that would be a departure from the usual practice. In the past no further consultations had been held on texts adopted by technical meetings or committees of experts and then submitted to the Governing Body, and it was difficult to see who could be consulted on the matter and how any further observations could be incorporated into such texts after the event. The Governing Body should therefore adopt the recommendation in paragraph 58 as now worded and the compendium should be published as soon as possible.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) thanked Mr. Richan for chairing the Committee in his stead and congratulated him on the skill with which, by all accounts, he had discharged his duties.

Mr. Heldal (Government, Norway) agreed with the arguments put forward by Miss González Martinez and Mr. Muhr in favour of holding the Ninth Session of the Petroleum Committee as early as possible in 1980. His reasons were summarised in paragraph 16 of the report.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), in answer to Mr. Maier, insisted that the Employer's group should have time to comment on the compendium of good practices. Though tripartite, the composition of the meeting had been narrow and the members of the Governing Body should be allowed to look at the text more closely before approving it, since in talks held on the basis of the compendium it might be assumed that it was a broadly accepted ILO text.

The Chairman pointed out that paragraph 58 made it clear that the Governing Body was called on merely to take note of the text. So far as communication of the report and compendium to the bodies mentioned in that paragraph was concerned, it was hard to see how any observations from the Employer members might be incorporated in those texts retroactively.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) agreed. The compendium had been adopted by a tripartite meeting, and it would run counter to the principle of tripartism to tack unilateral comments on to it; but there was nothing to prevent anyone from commenting on the compendium at any time, even long after the three-month period.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 11, 28, 30, 42, 58 and 59 of the report.
Report of the Committee on Freedom of Association

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) wished, on behalf of the Workers' group, to make some general comments on the Committee's working methods before the Governing Body considered the reports in detail. The Worker members had once again felt deep concern on reading the reports, but this time they felt that it was not enough for the Governing Body just to express indignation. Action was now urgently needed to make the Committee's work more effective - and no one underestimated the Committee's sense of duty and responsibility.

The Workers were glad to see that the Committee intended to review its working methods and they wished to make three proposals.

Their first related to governments which gave little or no information in reply to requests in the Committee's reports. Such governments' blatant refusal to co-operate bore witness to their scorn for the ILO's authority, and the Committee should be empowered not merely to express concern but to recommend appropriate action, such as drawing up a special list of unco-operative countries like those mentioned in paragraphs 9, 10 and 13 of the 177th Report. In any event the Office should publicise the bad faith shown by certain countries.

The Workers' second proposal related to countries, such as Chile and Uruguay, which gave no effect to the Committee's recommendations and where there had been no improvements for years. The Workers noted with satisfaction the recommendation in the Committee's 179th Report for inviting the Minister of Labour of Uruguay to appear in person before the Committee and for giving a hearing to the complainant organisations as well. As to Chile, however, they wondered whether it would serve any real purpose to send an Office representative to that country for direct contacts. For that case too the other method, i.e. a personal appearance of the Minister of Labour, seemed preferable.

Thirdly, the Workers proposed that the Governing Body should consider other steps designed to lend greater impact to ILO decisions. At the Governing Body's last session they had proposed breaking off ILO technical co-operation with member States which violated freedom of association. Where appropriate, ILO offices in such countries should also be closed down. How could the ILO consider holding two meetings in Uruguay, for example, as was suggested in the first Office paper on the eighteenth agenda item in the section entitled "Other forthcoming meetings", when Uruguay showed not the slightest willingness to co-operate with the Organisation?

The Director-General could count on the Workers' full support in his efforts to persuade other United Nations organisations, particularly the financial ones, to withhold credits from countries which were not fulfilling their international obligations in regard to freedom of association.

Mr. Helas (Government, Austria) wholeheartedly endorsed the Workers' statement.

Mr. Griffin (Government, Venezuela) also broadly supported the statement. He asked whether there was a formal proposal not to send an Office representative to Chile for direct contacts but to follow some other course of action.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) answered that the Workers did indeed believe that hearing the Ministers of Labour in the Committee on Freedom of Association would be more effective than direct contacts, particularly in the case of Chile.

Mr. Sánchez Madariaga (Worker, Mexico) endorsed what the Workers' spokesman had said. The cases which had been before the Committee on Freedom of Association for years concerned not just breaches of the right to organise but the actual dissolution of trade unions, bans on even small trade union meetings, which were branded as subversive, military operations to which many workers fell victims, the arrest and banishment of trade unionists and the withdrawal of their citizenship. In many countries such practices caused loss not just of trade union rights but also of personal freedoms and even of life. It was clear that, things being what they were, the Committee on Freedom of Association could not go on just giving good
advice and making pleas for freedom of association. It must now adopt new, more effective and more realistic procedures. One such procedure might be that recommended by Mr. Huhr - to give a hearing to the complainant organisations and to a representative of the accused government. The various ILO bodies and the Office should also act promptly when complaints as serious as the most recent ones were filed.

True, in the case of Tunisia a senior member of the Office staff had gone to that country without delay, but in many other cases a report was still awaited from the government, or the report was incomplete or late, so that requests had to be made, time and again before satisfaction was obtained. Time slipped by, sometimes the proceedings took years, and all the time workers crowded the prisons, labour codes remained a dead letter and all the ILO's principles were flouted. Chile was a case in point. In Chile, unlike other countries, the workers had been paralysed not by a mass movement but by military men who had gone down into the streets and grabbed power, overthrown a democratically elected government, broken up the trade unions and indulged in brutality of all the kinds abhorred by the civilised world.

The Committee on Freedom of Association should be given the means of action which present-day conditions demanded.

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) said that the Employers, too, were concerned at the trade union situation in several countries and would like to see the Committee take more effective action. But that would largely depend on how cooperative governments were. As soon as they showed even a slight readiness to cooperate there was some hope for a gradual return to normality.

Mr. Huhr had suggested drawing up a special list of countries which refused to give the information the Committee asked for. The Employers were not opposed to setting out special treatment to countries which persisted in turning a deaf ear.

Mr. Huhr had also proposed, presumably with reference to a particular case, giving a hearing to the labour minister of the countries in question. The Employers saw no incompatibility between direct contacts and the hearing of ministers. The two methods might even be combined. Direct contacts made for prompter action but were no reason for not inviting the minister to appear at the Conference.

Mr. Acci (Government, Italy), speaking as Chairman of the Committee on Freedom of Association, said that the members of the Committee were the first to admit the usefulness of reforming certain of its procedures. After all, the Committee had for the first time departed from a practice followed for decades and proposed hearing the parties at its next meeting. The new method would thus be put to the test.

Whether the Committee's procedures were effective and prompt did not really depend on the Committee but on the ILO's general attitude towards its member States and on the readiness of some of them to co-operate. Otherwise the Governing Body would have to provide the Committee with means of coercion to force governments to respect its recommendations. Meanwhile, patience coupled with perseverance was surely the best approach, indeed the only productive one.

Several proposals had been made in the debate. It had been said that the Committee should react whenever a government refused to co-operate. But at least half the Committee's recommendations to the Governing Body were for urging the government to reply or for deploring delays in replying or lack of co-operation.

Much had been said of the need to inform the government as soon as a complaint was filed. The Committee agreed and, so far as he knew, receivable complaints had always been forwarded to the government without delay.

Another proposal was for a special list. But would such a list serve much purpose? Could the special list which already existed for the application of Conventions and Recommendations really be said to have been a success? The effect of such a list for freedom of association might be to make governments ignore the Committee altogether. Under the procedure for other standards, the situation in all countries bar none was subject to review; but the procedure proposed for freedom of association would apply only to governments against which complaints had been lodged. Many other countries would escape notice altogether because, though the trade union situation was just as bad, it had not formed the subject of a complaint. A special list drawn up by the Committee on Freedom of Association might thus fail to give an accurate picture of the situation.
Several members had spoken of the cases of Uruguay and Chile and suggested that the Committee should follow the same procedure for Chile as for Uruguay and give both sides a hearing. After a full review of both cases, the Committee had come to the opinion that in the case of Uruguay, hearings would serve to determine whether the reforms which had been promised and seemed to be under way had been embodied in draft legislation - the text of which could of course not be made public until it had been considered by parliament. As to the case of Chile, hearings in Geneva would not be nearly as effective as sending an experienced representative of the Director-General to Chile to talk to those representing the various sectors of public opinion. The Committee on Freedom of Association had carefully pondered the advantages and the drawbacks before recommending different procedures for the two cases.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking for the Workers, paid tribute to the ability of the Chairman of the Committee. None other than Mr. Ago could have been so well qualified to sum up the position. To avoid any misunderstanding it should be made clear that, on learning that the Committee itself intended to look for ways of making its action more effective, the Workers had wanted to comment so that the Committee could take account of their views when it came to review its procedures. In the last resort it would be for the Governing Body to decide on such action as breaking off technical cooperation with certain countries or closing down certain ILO offices, but, first, it should of course consult the Committee.

The latter might consider whether merely drawing up a special list or announcing that the unresponsive attitude of certain governments would be made public would not be an effective way of applying pressure. Such a list might be made available directly to the Conference, without reference to any intermediate bodies in which it might be questioned or altered, and would usefully draw attention to flagrant violations of ILO principles.

Mr. Pimenov (Worker, USSR) said that the Workers unanimously supported their spokesman's suggestions. He felt deep respect for the high-minded views expressed by Mr. Ago, to whom he always listened with keen interest. But the Governing Body had serious cases before it and points of philosophy were of no use to workers. The fact of the matter was that flagrant violations of trade union rights had been reported; yet the Governing Body had had to admit its own impotence. This was no time to glory in past achievements: the Worker members were looking for practical results.

The case of Chile was dealt with in the Committee's 177th Report. What was going on in that country? Two million people were without an adequate income, two families out of five were underfed, and a fifth of the working population was unemployed. A federation of Chilean trade unions had survived at the background of repression described by Mr. Sánchez Madariaga. Because a federation of Chilean trade unions had survived some people imagined that a degree of freedom was being introduced. In point of fact repression was growing worse in all its forms. Mr. Ago advised patience, but for years the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and the ILO's Committee on Freedom of Association had been vainly denouncing the violations of human, civil and trade union rights in Chile. How much longer was one to be patient? And how did the ILO expect to influence the Government of Uruguay if at the same time it agreed to hold meetings in that country? What was needed was prompt and effective action of the kind proposed by Mr. Muhr.

Mr. González Navarro (Worker, Venezuela) believed that freedom of association was of great importance in preserving that mutual tolerance which should govern both industrial and human relations.

He deplored the constant government meddling in trade union activities, the dissolution of organisations, the breaking up of workers' meetings held to discuss collective agreements, and the persecution, torturing and restrictions on the freedom of association leaders which were common practice in many countries. In Latin America and the Caribbean alone there were at least a dozen countries where workers' rights were being flouted. Yet the deplorable fact was that some of those countries were receiving technical assistance from the ILO.

The efforts of the Committee on Freedom of Association were highly commendable, but the time had come to apply moral constraints. There was no reason for the ILO to hold technical meetings in a country ruled by a dictatorship which was violating human and trade union rights. Why should the ILO not cut off...
technical assistance to any country which disregarded its standards, and shut down its offices there? The lack of sanctions merely reassured such regimes, but moral pressure might deflect them from their course.

Working people and mankind at large were threatened by two cancerous evils—racial discrimination and the denial of freedom of association—which must be rooted out. The ILO was better fitted for the task than anyone because it enjoyed moral authority and had spokesmen in all countries. It should be ready to fight hard to right such wrongs, which constituted violations not only of trade union rights but also of the right of every human being to live in peace and freedom.

Mr. Griffin (Government, Venezuela) pointed out that at the last meeting of the Committee on Freedom of Association he had noted the contrast between the blandness of some of the Committee’s recommendations and the cruelty of the acts of brutality and repression reported in the confidential papers submitted to the Committee. The Committee should put an end to the practice of merely “deploring” or “deeply regretting” some atrocity or other. At the present sitting many pleas had been made for the Committee to be more active and dynamic and look into every means of bringing about improvement. The Venezuelan Government supported those pleas.

A special list should be prepared, but with great caution and starting with the worst cases, which should be denounced.

There were other measures which the ILO should take to prevent loss of confidence in its work. For example, it should have the courage to stop holding meetings in countries which were blatantly disregarding the principles of freedom of association. Nor should it lend technical co-operation of any kind to such countries. Some of the measures proposed, however, were not really practicable—for example, dismissing from the Office staff nationals of countries which did not respect trade union rights. In the first place those staff members had solemnly promised loyal performance of their international duties. Secondly, many international officials were looked on with disfavour by the government of their country.

It was difficult to go along with Mr. Ago’s appeal for patience. What was needed was action, and for that purpose one possibility was for the Committee on Freedom of Association to be authorised to act proprio motu, without waiting for an authorised organisation to file a written complaint. When trade union rights were being grossly violated the ILO should be able to intervene and do its utmost to restore things to normal.

Mr. Muhr had proposed—and Mr. Sánchez Madariaga had agreed with him—that the Director-General should not send a representative to Chile but that the Chilean Minister of Labour should be invited, like the Minister of Labour of Uruguay, to appear before the Committee. The first thing to do was indeed to issue such an invitation. Giving a hearing to the Minister and the representatives of the organisations concerned would help to verify the Chilean Government’s contention that matters had been restored to normal. If that method worked it could be applied to any other country against which a complaint had been filed. Moreover, hearings in the Committee as a whole would probably afford greater promise of success than a mission by a single representative of the Director-General who would be dealing with the whole of Chile.

The sitting closed at 6.10 p.m.

The discussion was adjourned to a later sitting.¹

¹ See seventh sitting.
SEVENTH SITTING
(Thursday, 2 March 1978, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.10 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Morris.

ELEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association (concl.)

Mr. Sunde (Worker, Norway) observed that the previous day's discussion left one with a feeling of helplessness. In his opinion the difficult cases were of four kinds: first, cases in which the government did not reply; secondly, those in which the government took too long to reply; thirdly, those in which the replies were incomplete; and, fourthly, and perhaps worst of all, those in which governments did not act on the Governing Body's recommendations.

Since it was a complex matter, and particularly since any really effective action might mean amending the Constitution, the Governing Body would be well advised to refer the whole matter back to the Committee for consideration at its next meeting and for the submission of specific proposals to the Governing Body.

Paragraphs 9 to 13 of the 177th Report showed that the direct contacts procedure had not proved possible in Liberia, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala or Bangladesh. In most cases the governments concerned had not even taken the trouble of answering the letters conveying to them the Governing Body's recommendations. It was to be hoped that the Governing Body would unanimously express its concern and disappointment at the utter indifference shown by those governments. That things had reached such a sorry pass showed up the shortcomings, not of the Office, whose action continued to be beyond praise, but of the present procedure.

Mr. Ahmed (Worker, Pakistan) said that national law prescribing trade union rights often remained a dead letter in countries without a strong trade union movement. That was why workers the world over looked to the ILO as the last-ditch defender of the basic rights laid down in the Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia. Although the ILO had been founded nearly 59 years before, several member States, such as Chile, were still flouting the workers' most basic rights. The procedures now in force were too lengthy, and all too often the patient died before the doctor arrived with the cure. As had been said the day before, more effective procedures should therefore be worked out.

Mr. Ventejol (Government, France) considered the debate to be one of crucial importance. Trade union freedoms had a bearing on individual human rights and on tripartism, that basic ILO principle which required that each of the groups should enjoy full autonomy and freedom.

France had always been opposed to condemning any nation a priori and was in favour of speeding up the procedure for ascertaining the truth and reporting to the Governing Body. None of the methods now being used should be rejected, and there was no need to choose between inquiries on the spot and inviting those responsible for freedom of association at the national level to come to Geneva. Indeed in many cases the two methods could be combined.

It appeared that in the debate the distinction had not always been properly drawn between the role of the Committee on Freedom of Association and that of the Governing Body. In fact their functions were not the same. The Committee made inquiries and recommendations, while the Governing Body made the decisions, based on the proposals before it. Even so, the Governing Body would some day have to assess the effectiveness of its procedures in regard to countries which failed to respect freedom of association or were glaringly and persistently remiss in the pursuit of ILO objectives.

---

1 See sixth sitting.
As to the proposal for drawing up a "special list", in a sense such a list
existed already since in several cases member States had already been condemned for
their attitude. On the other hand, the actual drawing up of a list might give any
countries not included in it the impression that they were totally blameless: the
truth of the matter was not quite that simple.

Mr. Salanne (Worker, France) agreed that the Committee on Freedom of
Association was a delicate piece of machinery and that great caution was needed if
its authority and effectiveness were to be preserved, as indeed the Workers' group
and the Governing Body itself had recognised. But there was another aspect of
the matter which was just as important - the systematic spread of trade union
repression in far too many countries. In such an unacceptable situation the
Governing Body's own responsibilities had to be more clearly defined.

What, then, could the Governing Body do if, once the Committee had exhausted
its own procedures, there was no real change in a country? Probably in such cases a
special list would have to be drawn up, but above all a decision would have to be
made at long last to impose sanctions of the kind suggested - the discontinuance of
ILO meetings in the countries concerned, the withholding of technical co-operation
or the closing down of any ILO documentation centres or branch offices.

That was a step the Governing Body would have to resolve to take, now that
things had reached an intolerable pass for so many workers in so many countries.

Miss Gonzalez Martinez (Government, Mexico) wished to confirm everything that
had been said by the Mexican Government representative at the last session when the
Governing Body had considered the Committee's reports.

Like Mr. Ruhr, Mr. Sanchez Madariaga and others the Mexican Government
considered it most important to speed up and strengthen the procedures so as to
prevent dilatory and procrastinating tactics which might undermine confidence in the
unique procedures of which the ILO had every right to be proud.

Mr. Kosting (Government, USSR) fully endorsed what Mr. Muhr, Mr. Griffin and
many others had said.

Without wishing to belittle the ILO's means for dealing with the difficult
problems under discussion, he still thought that ILO action would be more effective
if pressure were brought to bear on the governments mentioned in the 177th Report.
He did not believe that forbearance was the wisest counsel: urgent action was called
for.

The case of Chile, for example, had come up before the Governing Body time and
again, and the Committee on Freedom of Association had considered it at six
successive meetings. At its last session, in January 1978, the ad hoc working group
of the United Nations which was inquiring into the situation in Chile had been
informed that trade union repression and unlawful arrest and detention were still
rife. The Chilean authorities would not admit to the arrests and, as the evidence
considered by the working group bore out, it was common for those arrested to be
killed or simply to disappear. At least 2,000 Chileans, it was thought, had
disappeared after arrest. The ILO should make every effort to find a more effective
way of protecting civil and trade union rights in Chile.

Mr. Marton (Government, Hungary) agreed with Mr. Ventejol that the Committee's
procedure should be speeded up and new methods of action worked out in co-operation
with the Governing Body. That was the best way of protecting the interests of
workers throughout the world, particularly workers and trade unions in Chile, whose
plight imperatively called for more vigorous ILO action.

Mr. Ago (Government, Italy) welcomed the present Governing Body discussion.

Like Mr. Ventejol and Mr. Salanne, he felt that a distinction should be drawn
between the action of the Committee on Freedom of Association and that of the other
ILO bodies with competence for freedom of association. The Committee applied
procedures which had stood the test of time, although some might prove more
effective than others. It adapted its methods to suit the cases which came before
it; it was also considering new ones, such as oral proceedings.

That new procedure should be put to the test, but might not be suited to all
cases. It would place more stress on the quasi-judicial nature of the Committee's
work and require much longer meetings. If the parties were to accept the summons - particularly the governments, which were often highly sensitive about national sovereignty - the hearings would have to afford full guarantees of objectivity and fairness. The Committee would have to ensure strict observance of the rules, and its members, who were appointed in their personal capacity, would have to keep their minds free of any national feeling or personal conviction.

If the Committee had proposed holding hearings in the case of Uruguay but not in that of Chile, it was because it expected the mission of an authorised representative of the Director-General to Chile to produce practical results. In the light of any information which the representative obtained in Chile in talks with members of the Government and, if possible, with prisoners and representatives of the opposition movements, the Committee could decide whether to hear the parties in Geneva.

Mr. Griffin had criticised the language of the Committee's recommendations, which he found too bland. In fact, the Committee discussed its draft texts at length and deliberately chose such terms as "deplore", "note with concern" and "express disappointment", which meant just what they said. Addressing governments in stronger language might not be the way to achieve the best results. In cases where the Committee had used fairly strong language governments had used this as an excuse for claiming that they had been insulted and their sovereignty flouted; the upshot had been further delay in securing information or action. Little purpose would be served by departing from the judicial language, courteous but firm, which had been used in the past and alone had produced results. However modest it might seem, the Committee's action had saved many lives and freed many from prison.

In cases which the Committee saw no point pursuing further itself, it was for the Governing body, or possibly the Conference, to do so and take political, as distinct from judicial, action. True, in some cases a political decision such as closing down a branch office or breaking off technical assistance might be an effective sanction. In other cases, however, ending technical assistance, say, might merely make things worse for the workers and dim any hopes for an early easing of repression. Other possibilities open to the Conference and the Governing Body included publicising certain cases in resolutions or other texts. That again was a form of political action which might be more effective than the measures open to the Committee.

Mr. Griffin (Government, Venezuela) agreed with Mr. Ago that the rules of courtesy should be observed. In the last resort the language and tone of the Committee's recommendations were merely matters of form. What really mattered was that the Governing Body should act, and it should now consider what practical steps the ILO could take in the present situation. The Governing Body should now take a decision on the proposals which had been made.

The Chairman declared the general discussion closed and invited the Governing Body to consider the Committee's reports.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH REPORT

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 2 and 11 of the report.

The Director-General, alluding to paragraph 12 of the report, said that as a result of the events of January 1978 in Tunisia several workers' organisations had asked the Office to get in touch with the Tunisian Government and had filed formal complaints of violation of trade union rights. The latest complaint had been that filed by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions on 27 February 1978.

The Director-General had accordingly asked Mr. Bertil Bolin, Deputy Director-General, to go to Tunisia to obtain fuller information on the events there and to convey to the Government the concern felt by the ILO and the international world of labour about the trade union situation, and particularly the fate of the arrested trade union leaders.

Mr. Bolin had met the Prime Minister, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Labour, as well as trade union leaders temporarily in charge of the General Confederation of Tunisian Workers (UGTT) and the leaders of the Tunisian Union for Trade, Industry and Handicrafts. During the talks, particularly those
with members of the Government, he had been assured that Tunisia's attitude towards
the application of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, which it had ratified, would remain
unchanged. He had also been given confirmation of Tunisia's determination to
protect trade union rights.

The Prime Minister and his colleagues had assured Mr. Bolin that the leaders
of the UGT T held in custody would be tried by a common-law court, that they would be
given every facility to prepare their defence and that the trials would begin once
the preliminary investigations were over.

Mr. Bolin's mission had been necessary and useful, and it seemed to meet the
kind of preoccupations just expressed with regard to various cases before the
Committee. As was said in paragraph 12 of the report, the complaints had been
communicated to the Tunisian Government and would be considered by the Committee in
the usual way. With remarkable promptness the Government had sent the Office a
detailed communication in reply to the charges set forth in the first of the
complaints filed with the Office.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking for the Workers' group, thanked the Director-General for having acted so promptly by sending Mr.
Bolin to Tunisia. He hoped that the Government was aware of the interest of world
opinion in events there. The Workers' group would like the Director-General to keep
a close watch on the situation and miss no opportunity to impress upon the Tunisian
authorities the Workers' keen disappointment at seeing a country so conspicuously
and for so many years devoted to the ILO and its principles embark on the same paths
as others whose conduct the Organisation had time and again condemned.

Mr. Chérif (Government, Tunisia) confirmed the Tunisian Government's devotion
to the principles of freedom of association. On becoming independent in 1956
Tunisia had ratified many ILO Conventions, including the Freedom of Association and
Protection of the Right to Organise Convention (No. 87) and the Right to Organise
and Collective Bargaining Convention (No. 98). Since then it had regularly supplied
the reports called for on the application of the Conventions and so far had received
no observations from the Committee of Experts. The reports sent to the Office,
including those on Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, had always been communicated to the
two main workers' and employers' organisations, which had never made any objections.

Soon after receiving the first of the complaints forwarded by the Office, on
3 February, the Tunisian authorities had answered the various charges. Though
believing the complaint to be unfounded, they accepted that it was for the Committee
on Freedom of Association to investigate the charges.

Those arrested would be brought before a common-law court and would be free to
choose their defence counsel. Observers would be admitted to the hearings, which
would be public.

The Tunisian Government had no intention of curtailing freedom of association
in any way. Under national law and in keeping with international labour standards
the trade unions still enjoyed their rights in full, as evidenced by the holding on
25 February of a special assembly at which the workers had freely chosen their
representatives. The Tunisian Government was determined to go on co-operating with
the ILO and fulfilling its commitments with regard to trade union rights.

Mr. Makhlouf (Worker, Tunisia) thanked the Director-General for his immediate
response to the sad events in Tunisia and endorsed Mr. Muhr's remarks. In
accordance with the statutes of the trade union confederation a board meeting had
been held on 2 February at which UGT T bodies had taken several decisions. The
administrative committee had endorsed those decisions and decided to convene a
special assembly on 25 February. The assembly had elected an executive board and
trade union activities had since been carried on freely and democratically, as in
the past.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 9, 25, 41, 65 and
72 of the report.

Mr. Robel (Worker, Madagascar), referring to Case No. 853, which related to
Chad, pointed out that according to paragraph 77 of the report the freezing of trade
union funds was preventing the National Union of Workers of Chad (UNATEAT) from
fulfilling its financial obligations. These included the payment of the salaries of
the trade union staff and the payment of bills, and the failure to meet them was
causing hardship to many. The Committee's recommendations in paragraph 87 should therefore be supplemented by a further one designed to end the freeze on trade union funds. That would enable UNATRAT to meet its obligations, even if its activities were to be still suspended.

The Chairman said that the Government's attention could be drawn to the need to end the freeze of UNATRAT funds in order to enable that organisation to meet its obligations, notably in regard to the payment of the salaries of its permanent staff.

It was so agreed.


Mr. Montt Balmaceda (Employer, Chile) preferred, for obvious reasons, not to go into the substance of the case relating to Chile, which was dealt with in paragraphs 175 to 219 of the report. He thought it a good idea, however, to send a personal representative of the Director-General to Chile to make inquiries and, where appropriate, confer with the national authorities.

Given the situation in Chile, and the almost hysterical reaction to which it sometimes gave rise, political misgivings about the idea of a mission by a representative of the Director-General were understandable. There were nevertheless good chances that that would be the wisest course in the present circumstances, from the point of view of the Chilean workers themselves.

Mr. Cairo Solar (Government, Cuba) noted with deep sorrow that human and trade union rights were still being commonly violated in Chile and that the junta had not yet given a satisfactory reply to the requests addressed to it.

Once again the Committee had received no further information on many people who had been arrested or had "disappeared". In some cases the information supplied was at odds with the complaints filed. The junta was plainly trying to conceal the crimes it was charged with in the hope that they would not be denounced before the bar of world opinion. Its attitude put the Governing Body's patience sorely to the test and, as Mr. Griffin had said, the time for patience was now over.

As to paragraphs 179 to 195 (arrest or disappearance of trade unionists) and 196 to 205 (forced residence of trade unionists) of the report, at its last session the United Nations General Assembly had by a large majority adopted a resolution demanding that the junta should forthwith end the intolerable practice of secret detention followed by the disappearance of people whose imprisonment was consistently denied or disavowed, and without further delay explain what had become of those people. The General Assembly had also again expressed the international community's indignation at the constant and flagrant violations of human rights and basic freedoms in Chile.

At its current session in Geneva the United Nations Commission on Human Rights had said that it shared the General Assembly's indignation about what was going on in Chile. The ILO could not fail to join the rest of the United Nations in condemning the junta's brutalities. The violations of trade union rights accounted for much of the unending list of breaches of human rights in Chile, and the Committee on Freedom of Association and the Governing Body should take more vigorous action to make the junta restore those rights. The speaker therefore endorsed the Workers' proposal for closing down the ILO regional office in Santiago and breaking off any technical assistance to the Chilean regime.

He was not against trying direct contacts, although he was not sure that the procedure suggested in paragraph 219(e) of the report would achieve anything worth while in the present case. Having dodged questions put to it in writing the junta could also dodge them when they were put to it orally, or it could call false witnesses.

The Cuban Government was equally concerned about the violations of human and trade union rights in Uruguay.

Mr. Sánchez Madariaga (Worker, Mexico), referring to the case of Chile, said that he had recently been approached by members of the family of Mr. Bernardo Araya. The authorities maintained that Mr. Araya had left Chile for Argentina but,
according to sworn evidence, he had been thrown into gaol and tortured. His family had made an appeal, and the speaker supported it, that the Chilean Government should again be urged to give more information on what had happened to Mr. Araya after he had disappeared.

The Chairman asked the Governing Body whether it agreed that the Chilean Government's attention should be drawn specifically to the case of Mr. Araya.

It was so agreed.

Mr. Griffin (Government, Venezuela) wished to know whether the Workers' group maintained the opposition expressed by its spokesman the day before to the idea of a direct contacts mission to Chile.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) explained that, although the Workers' group doubted whether direct contacts could achieve anything in Chile and wondered whether more could not be achieved by oral questioning of the Minister of Labour, they would be prepared to accept the former method if the Committee and the Governing Body felt that it offered any chances of success.

Mr. Pimenov (Worker, USSR) understood that the Workers' group had unanimously recommended the latter method, together with resort to such sanctions as refusing to hold meetings and suspending other forms of activity in countries like Uruguay. Should the Governing Body therefore not decide on those recommendations?

The Chairman observed that no formal proposal had been made. The general understanding had been that the Committee would study these matters at its next meeting in the context of the review of its procedures. If the Governing Body wished to take a decision now, a formal proposal would have to be made.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) repeated that the Workers' group had no wish to rule out either of the two methods. There was no reason why the direct contacts procedure should not be supplemented by a hearing of the Minister of Labour. What the Workers' group wanted was that the Committee on Freedom of Association should review the usefulness of the direct-contacts procedure in special cases like that of Chile. If the Committee thought the procedure still useful, the Workers would not oppose it.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation of the report.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) referred to the Committee's recommendations on the case relating to Peru in paragraph 312 of the report. The Workers proposed deleting the words "on condition that such action consists merely in the expression of a protest, and does not lead to acts of violence" at the end of paragraph 312(a). They also proposed deleting those words at the end of the recommendation in paragraph 374(a) on the case relating to Colombia. While of course opposed to acts of violence, they felt that those words greatly reduced the trade unions' freedom of action.

Mr. Ago (Government, Italy) observed that the report before the Governing Body was the work of the Committee and that the Committee alone could alter the text. Never before had the Governing Body amended the texts of any of the Committee's reports referred to it. The 177th Report had been adopted unanimously, in other words with the agreement of the Worker members of the Committee. It would, however, be perfectly in order for the Workers' spokesman to make a statement, which could be recorded in the minutes.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) understood that the governing Body was being asked to endorse the Committee's recommendations. If it was not, the Workers' group would like the Committee to reconsider the wording of the recommendations in question; in any event, their views should be recorded in the minutes.

Mr. Harvey Sapper (Government, Colombia) agreed with Mr. Ago. The recommendations were always carefully worded, and changing any part of the text would upset the balance of the whole. It would therefore be unadvisable to strike anything out of the recommendations relating to Peru and Colombia. Acts of violence called for a formal repudiation. Governments bore responsibility for public order, and it was vital to check anything which might prevent them from fulfilling that responsibility.
The Chairman thought that Mr. Muhe's point was well taken. Acts of violence were often provoked on purpose. In their present wording the recommendations might be taken to mean that in future no complaint might be filed if an act of violence had been committed. The wording should be revised and it was to be hoped that in future the Committee would take care that its recommendations were quite unambiguous and did not give rise to similar discussions.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 342, 334 and 349 of the report.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHTH REPORT

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 4 of the report.

Mr. Muhe (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) welcomed the improvements in the trade union situation in Bolivia.

Mr. Caballero Tameso (representative of the Government of Bolivia attending the session in accordance with Article 26, paragraph 5, of the Constitution) said that the information he had given at the Governing Body's November 1977 session on progress in restoring the situation to normal was borne out by the information in paragraphs 16 and 19 of the report.

Such progress fitted logically and naturally into the broader context of co-operation between Bolivia and the ILO and met the concern expressed by the Committee on Freedom of Association. The Government's co-operation was not purely pragmatic but sprang from a firm belief that promoting the workers' interests in a democratic society with full respect for ILO principles was one of the main conditions for strengthening the national institutional order. The Bolivian trade union movement could be expected to co-operate calmly and responsibly in the task of consolidation.

The official information on progress summarised in the report might well have convinced the Committee that the grounds for the complaints had disappeared. Instead, the Committee had decided to make an interim report and to recommend asking the Government once again to supply further information on developments in the trade union situation.

Paragraph 22(c) of the report recommended that the miners' radio stations should soon be returned to the workers and to their organisations, and there was a danger that that recommendation might set a precedent for treating the control of powerful means of radio broadcasting as an essential condition of freedom of association. It was doubtful whether such a condition should be laid down in the particular case of Bolivia, where, as the Committee well knew, the radio stations mentioned had not always been used for exclusively trade union purposes.

The Bolivian Government was nevertheless willing to accept unreservedly the Committee's recommendations to the Governing Body.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 22 of the report.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINTH REPORT

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 4 and 20 of the report.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTIETH REPORT

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 4 and 33 of the report.
TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee

Ms Caron (Government, Canada) announced that her Government had authorised the payment to the ILO of a voluntary contribution amounting to $200,000.

Mr. Hodgkins (Government, United Kingdom) said that his Government had offered a contribution of $250,000.

First Report

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 3 of the report. Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France), speaking as Reporter of the Committee, said that, as appeared from paragraph 4 of the report, there had been no discussion on the implementation of the Programme and Budget for 1976-77. That was because the Committee had had a heavy workload. However, the Office paper had shown that for all the difficulties and uncertainties the programme for 1976-77 had on the whole been carried out. What was more, the paper itself was a remarkably concise and synthetic piece of drafting, and indeed a model of its kind.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) endorsed Mr. Oechslin's remarks and on behalf of the Workers congratulated the Director-General and the Office on all they had managed to do during one of the most difficult periods of ILO history.

As to the international labour standards programme, which had been dealt with in the paper on programme implementation submitted to the Committee, it was gratifying to see that there had been a large increase in the number of new ratifications over the last two years and that 70 per cent of them were accounted for by developing countries. That belied the misgivings often expressed and testified to the relevance of ILO standards for such countries.

As regards paragraphs 13 to 23 of the report, the Workers were deeply worried about the position of the Working Capital Fund. It was vital that the Fund should fulfil its function: the risk that it might be exhausted just when it was needed was not an acceptable one. The procedure for building up and replenishing the Fund's resources should be considered as soon as possible.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France) expressed the Employers' agreement with Mr. Muhr's remarks on the Working Capital Fund.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), referring to the measures contemplated for securing prompt payment of contributions, as dealt with in paragraphs 24 to 41 of the report, urged governments on the Workers' behalf to meet their financial obligations when due. The Financial Regulations might have to be amended to ensure that the Office received the contributions when it needed them. At present the Regulations stipulated that contributions fell due on 1 January, and it could only be hoped that governments would keep strictly to that date.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France), referring to paragraph 41 of the report, expressed the hope that the Director-General would soon submit specific proposals.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) confirmed her Government's views, which were summarised in para. 31 of the report.

For her own and many other governments it was difficult, if not impossible, to pay on 1 January of the financial year. Could not a system of quarterly payments be introduced which would spread the ILO's income over the whole year and help governments in planning their payments?

1 GB.205/PFA/1/19.
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Since most United Nations agencies expected governments to pay their contributions in the first few months of the year, perhaps thought might be given to having the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination draw up a schedule for payments, with contributions to different agencies falling due on different dates. Such a solution would be helpful not just to the ILO but to the whole United Nations system.

The Chairman wondered whether governments might not in some cases resort to forward budgeting and, for example, provide in the national budget for 1978 for payment of the contribution due at the beginning of 1979. They would have to do that only once; afterwards payments would be up to date.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) said that her Government started work on the federal budget at the beginning of the year before the financial year. The draft budget went before Congress in September and was adopted by the Chamber of Deputies in December. Only the strict financial rules in force prevented the Mexican Government from paying its contribution to the ILO on 1 January of the following year.

Mr. Azimi (Government, Iran) drew attention to his Government's views as recorded in paragraph 34 of the report and asked that account should be taken of them if the Financial Regulations were to be amended.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 44 of the report.

Mr. Huhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking for the Workers' group, referred to the second report of the Working Party on International Labour Standards, which was discussed in paragraph 48 of the report. The Working Party classified Conventions and Recommendations under four headings, the third of which was "Other existing instruments". Putting an instrument in that group should not be taken to mean that its application should not receive continuing attention. There was no doubt but that that group included the many instruments recently ratified by developing countries, most of which were unable to ratify the instruments in the first group - "Existing instruments, ratification and application of which should be promoted on a priority basis". The Office should not discourage the developing countries by appearing to care less about the ratification and application of instruments in the third group.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France) referred to paragraphs 49 to 60 of the report, which related to the possible impact on the ILO's budget of further changes in the rate of exchange between the United States dollar and the Swiss franc. Those paragraphs dealt both with a short-term problem - the current budget and the action to be taken before the Conference session - and a medium-term problem - the fluctuations which would no doubt continue in the value of the dollar in Swiss francs. The Employers believed that at least that part of the budget which consisted of expenditure in Swiss francs should be expressed in that currency. It was scarcely conceivable that that would not have to be done sooner or later.

Mr. Huhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the Workers' support for Mr. Oechslin's remarks.

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) observed that in the Committee the Director-General had forecast a budget deficit of $30 million for the biennium, which would have to be met by means of additional contributions.

The Cuban Government had consistently maintained that States which were not to blame for monetary instability should not suffer its consequences. The losses to international organisations should be borne by those countries which bore the responsibility and in whose currencies United Nations expenditure was incurred. The deficit was due, not to ordinary expenditure on goods or services, but to losses which were not chargeable to the regular budget. Such losses should be made good by a special method of financing which did not unfairly penalise member States in no way responsible for exchange rate fluctuations - which fluctuations, by the way, mainly affected the developing countries.

One possibility would be to establish a fund with additional contributions from countries responsible for monetary instability and those on whose territory an international organisation was located, much to their advantage.

---
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On 1 December 1977 the Cuban Government had submitted a draft resolution to the Fifth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. The draft provided for a system of financing whereby four-fifths of the losses would be borne by the advanced countries in which United Nations bodies had their headquarters and the remainder by the other countries in amounts proportionate to their budget assessments under the approved scale for the current financial period. Those arrangements would not apply to any of the advanced countries which paid voluntary contributions to make up the losses incurred by the organisations because of inflation and monetary instability. Although no decision had yet been taken on the draft resolution, the Office should bear it in mind in making proposals for financing the deficit mentioned in paragraph 60 of the report.

**Miss González-Martínez (Government, Mexico)** reminded the Governing Body that at its last session she had already had occasion to express her Government's concern about the effects of exchange rate fluctuations on the financing of the ILO and other international organisations. She had suggested that the Director-General should consider the possibility of an agreement on monetary stabilisation between the host State and the International Monetary Fund. The Director-General had suggested determining contributions partly in dollars and partly in Swiss francs.

Whatever possibilities were being considered, the Office should inform member States as soon as possible so that the necessary consultations could be held before the Governing Body had to decide on the matter, in May. If the Director-General's proposals were not received by early May or, better still, by the end of April, it was doubtful whether the Governing Body could settle the matter to the ILO's benefit at its May session.

**The Director-General** said that he had pointed out to the Committee that the Office needed clear and precise guidance from the Committee, the Governing Body and the Conference. He would do his utmost to circulate a paper to the Governing Body towards the middle of April so that they would have over a month to study it, in the hope that some solution could be worked out at least in 1980-81, if not in 1979.

As to Miss González-Martínez's suggestion for staggering the payment of contributions, the Office would reflect carefully on the scheduling of payments by member States and might submit a paper on the subject to the Committee. If ever the idea of staggered payments were adopted, however, the few governments which did pay their contributions on 1 January should not be discouraged from paying promptly.

If such a system were introduced it would presumably have to include incentives for prompt payment and measures to ensure that it did not aggravate existing cash flow problems. The Office faced the most severe difficulties in this regard at the beginning of the year, when a reasonably good cash flow position was essential.

**Mr. Mühle (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany)**, referring to Mr. Cairo Soler's remarks, pointed out that countries with a stable currency need not normally suffer from dollar depreciation, which enabled them to buy dollars more cheaply. The advanced countries were already financing four-fifths of the budgets of the international organisations: could they, in addition, be expected to finance four-fifths of the cost of inflation?

**Mr. Delarbre (Government, France)** welcomed the Director-General's reply to Miss González-Martínez. He was himself about to ask that Office papers dealing with financial matters should be circulated promptly, since under established procedures budget estimates had to be drawn up well in advance. The Director-General's paper should perhaps explore in greater detail than was usual the possibility of expressing the budget partly in Swiss francs and partly in dollars. It might also compare the effects of such a budget with those of a budget stated wholly in dollars.

**Mr. Morales (Government, Colombia)**, whose Government had not taken part in the work of the Committee, supported what the Government representatives of Mexico and Brazil had said in the Committee and what Mr. Cairo Soler and Miss González-Martínez had just said. He asked the Director-General to bear in mind the difficult problems facing developing countries when he looked at the question of exchange rates and try to strike a fair balance between countries whose contributions had decreased because they had a strong currency and those whose currency was linked with the dollar or had even fallen against the dollar. He hoped that fair proposals would soon be made.
Mr. Azimi (Government, Iran) observed that paragraph 55 of the report summarised his Government’s views on the proposal that part of contributions should be paid in Swiss francs. Presumably there might also have to be consultations with the Swiss Government.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 62 of the report.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France), speaking as reporter of the Committee, drew attention to a mistake in the French version of paragraph 64 of the report, where "recommandation" should read "résolution".

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 64 of the report.

The sitting closed at 1 p.m.
The sitting opened at 3.30 p.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Morris.

Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee (concl.)

First Report (concl.)

Mr. Fogarty (Government, Australia) announced that his country would be making a contribution of $125,000 to the ILO. The funds would be for a project or projects in the Asian region, the exact nature of which would be determined in agreement with the ILO. This gesture was intended as a tangible expression of Australia's continued confidence in a unique organisation of which it had been a Member since its inception.

The Director-General expressed thanks to Ms. Caron, Mr. Hodgkins and Mr. Fogarty for the voluntary contributions announced by their respective countries. He had learnt from Mr. Haase that the Federal Republic of Germany was offering a voluntary contribution of US$700,000, for which he also expressed thanks. These new contributions totalled well over one million dollars.

Second Report

PERSONNEL QUESTIONS

The Staff Union representative (Mr. Tagi, Chairman of the Staff Union Committee) thanked the Chairman for allowing him to address the Governing Body directly. The staff had been deeply disturbed by the recommendation of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee concerning the implementation of the salary scale for General Service staff in Geneva recommended by the International Civil Service Commission. The statutory process of consultation had not been completed and the Governing Body Committee had not had a paper before it. Only a few oral explanations had been given and, in these circumstances, it would seem highly proper to postpone a decision.

The validity of the ICSC recommendations and of the survey which had preceded them could be seriously questioned, although that was not the immediate problem. For the Union the real question was not one of money but of principle - a question of respect for agreements, the protection of contractual rights and the correct application of the Staff Regulations.

The 1976 agreement had been freely negotiated, signed by the representatives of the Executive Heads and of the staff of the Geneva organisations, including the representatives of the Director-General and of the Staff Union of the ILO, and had been duly submitted to and approved by the Governing Body in May 1976.

The implementation of the proposed new scale would constitute, particularly for serving officials, a repudiation of that agreement. An agreement once made could be renegotiated, but it could not be unilaterally disregarded; that was quite contrary to the principles and rights proclaimed and defended by the Organisation throughout the world, particularly the right to bargain collectively.

1 See seventh sitting.

2 See also above, p. VII/6.
The application of the new scale, with the so-called transitional measures, would create inequality of remuneration not only between serving staff and any newly recruited staff, but also among serving staff since the salaries of officials doing the same job at the same grade and the same step would differ according to when their incremental dates happened to fall, or when they reached the top steps of their grades or according to the date on which they were promoted.

The only argument advanced in favour of applying the proposed new scale was that the common system was at stake and that it must be followed rigidly. The staff were increasingly cynical about a common system which centralised decision-making in a remote political body, which treated the dollar as stable and sovereign and which entailed flagrant injustices in the pension system. The so-called common system was not, in fact, all that common since it admitted of many exceptions.

It was, indeed, only right that there should be exceptions in so far as each organisation needed some degree of flexibility: if not, what was the purpose of the consultative machinery established by the Staff Regulations and submission of decisions to the Governing Body? As a tripartite organisation, the ILO should play a leading part in determining conditions of service for officials in the United Nations system, and certainly for its own staff. The Governing Body should reaffirm its responsibilities and prerogatives in that area.

This was one of the occasions when the principles of the ILO should take priority over other considerations. The decision which was being proposed was, in fact, contrary to the ILO principles and was not acceptable to employers and workers. It would be a breach of faith with the staff, which had in the past always given of its best to the ILO and whose confidence was vital to the Organisation's future.

The Governing Body must not betray that confidence, and the staff urged it to defer any decision in the matter so that the Director-General and the Union might continue discussions with the aim of reaching an agreed solution compatible with contractual rights and ILO principles.

Mr. Hodgkins (Government, United Kingdom) stated the position of his own Government and of those of Australia, Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Japan, as well as of certain countries which were Members of the ILO but were not represented on the Governing Body.

It was understandable that the matter should have aroused very strong feelings among the staff. The Secretary-General of the United Nations was himself keenly aware of the unsettled atmosphere which had existed since 1976. These were long-term issues which could not be resolved overnight. Efforts had been made to consult the staff, but they had not been wholly successful, and the staff should have more of an opportunity to express its views in the future. The methodology of the International Civil Service Commission would also have to be reviewed and a new survey carried out as soon as possible.

Meanwhile, the Governing Body seemed to have no real option but to accept the recommendations before it. A quick decision was needed if the revised scale was to be applied to the staff recruited for the Conference; as for serving officials, they would be protected by a transitional allowance and would suffer no cut in their present pay, only future increments being based on the new scale. The ILO staff would thus be dealt with on the same basis as other international officials in Geneva, as seemed only right. The ICSC should, as soon as possible, produce a new report in the fullest consultation with the staff.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) referred to the position of the Worker members as recorded in paragraphs 27 to 30 of the report. The Worker members could not accept the recommendations based on the ICSC conclusions which were before the Governing Body. Those conclusions could not be taken seriously: it was proclaimed, first, that salaries were 25 per cent too low and then that they were 17 per cent too high. The procedure which had been followed was, moreover, contrary to ILO principles, and the Organisation could hardly expect governments which had ratified Convention No. 98 to apply its provisions to their staffs if it failed to apply them to its own officials.

The ILO, by virtue of its aims, had a duty to ensure that those principles were recognised by the other organisations in the United Nations system. The Workers, for their part, could accept the suggestion that any decision should be postponed until May, in the hope that meanwhile the Director-General could reach a satisfactory solution through negotiation.
Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France) reminded the Governing Body that, at its May-June 1976 session, the Employers' spokesman had concluded - somewhat diffidently - that the Programme, Budget and Administrative Committee had no alternative but to recognise the new salary scales since they had been adopted by common agreement and it was essential to maintain uniformity with the other specialised agencies located in Geneva.

At the same time the ILO Governing Body, which was the only tripartite executive body in the United Nations family, could do no less than to express its views on the methods applied. As the Employers saw it - and they could boast some experience of labour-management relations - every conceivable error of collective bargaining had been committed. No doubt the status of international officials was not the same as that of salaried employees in the private sector, but the Organisation did have standards on bargaining and the determination of remuneration in the public service, and those standards should be applied especially by organisations in the United Nations family and, in the first place, by the ILO itself.

The Employers were disappointed at the way in which the whole matter had been handled, at the stage of the Battelle survey as well as later, after the International Civil Service Commission had come on the scene. They had expected more from persons said to be specialists in staff management. The ICSC should pay far more attention to ILO principles.

The Employers would not go so far as to associate themselves with all the criticisms expressed by the staff representative, and in particular with the serious allegation of a breach of contract, since the legal aspects of the matter were not very clear; but, clearly, a document signed by an eminent representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations was an important one which could not be treated lightly. In such a delicate matter undue haste should be avoided in reaching a decision.

The Director-General said that the ILO had always been keenly aware of its status as a tripartite organisation responsible for laying down collective bargaining principles. As such, it had never lost sight of the leading part it was called upon to play in discussions and negotiations within the common system concerning employment conditions. It would no doubt at some stage be necessary to examine the whole matter of the common system, but meanwhile he intended to take whatever action might from time to time be required to ensure that its operation met the interests both of the agencies - and the ILO in particular - and of their staff.

In his statement the Staff Union representative had referred insistently to a breach of contract and a violation of contractual rights thus raising a very serious question which required an answer - an answer which neither the Director-General nor the Governing Body were legally qualified to give. There were, however, bodies set up for that very purpose, and in particular the Administrative Tribunal.

The Director-General accordingly suggested that the Governing Body should authorise him to consult the Administrative Tribunal on its behalf and request it to give, as a matter of urgency, an opinion on whether a breach of contract or a violation of contractual rights had taken place. While such a procedure was not in line with the regular practice of the Tribunal, there was every reason to believe that it would respond quickly to such a request if made jointly by the Administration and the Union.

If that formula were accepted it might be agreed that the Governing Body's decision, whatever it might be, on the report of the Programme, Budget and Administrative Committee, would not be put into effect until the Tribunal's opinion had been received, i.e. not until May.

He suggested this in the hope that a concrete and practical solution might be found for a regrettable situation which everyone deplored. Because of the recruitment freeze there was no great danger at present; the only immediate problem concerned short-terms staff shortly to be recruited for the Conference, for whom it seemed clear that the new salary scale would be applied. There remained the preoccupying uncertainty as to whether or not there had been a breach of contract or a violation of contractual rights, which it was imperative to remove. An organisation with a philosophy, a tradition and a labour-management relations record such as that boasted by the ILO could not shirk such an obligation.
Mr. Ventejol (Government, France), speaking for the Governments of the United Kingdom, Italy and France, and after making it clear that, so far as his own country was concerned, there was no question of its disavowing its vote in the United Nations General Assembly in favour of the ICSC recommendation, said that the Governing Body should remain faithful to its principles. In the life of the Organisation just as in any labour-management relations system, collective bargaining and contracts were not matters to be taken lightly.

It would be wise, therefore, to pause for reflection and agree that the implementation of any decision which the Governing Body might now take would be suspended until the Administrative Tribunal had given an opinion. It was not a matter of obtaining a ruling in favour of one party against the other, but of finding out whether the implementation of a recommendation voted by the United Nations would entail an infringement of basic ILO principles of collective bargaining and labour-management relations.

Mr. Heldal (Government, Norway) also supported the Director-General's suggestion that an opinion should be sought from the Administrative Tribunal. His Government, like many others, saw considerable advantages in preserving the common system. That system could, however, be improved, and in particular it should be considered how far the principles of collective bargaining laid down by the relevant ILO instruments could be applied in determining the remuneration of officials employed by organisations of the United Nations family.

Mr. Pogarty (Government, Australia) could also accept the Director-General's suggestion. As he understood it, the Governing Body was being invited to endorse the Committee's recommendation, but without giving it immediate effect. He wondered how soon the Administrative Tribunal was likely to give its opinion.

The Director-General wished to make it clear that the matter on which it was proposed to consult the Administrative Tribunal concerned both the breach of the May 1976 agreement, viewed as a collective agreement, and that of individual contracts. The opinion would be requested as a matter of priority. There was every reason to think that the Administrative Tribunal would respond quickly, and the Governing Body would be informed at once.

Thus, the implementation of any decisions which the Governing Body might take at this stage would, as Mr. Ventejol had said, be suspended and nothing would be done until May. In the circumstances, it might be preferable to postpone a decision until then, especially as that would entail no risk from the Governing Body point of view. Of course, adoption by the Governing Body of a decision which would not take effect until later would, by the same token, entail no risk for the staff.

What really mattered was that full light should be shed on the matter, bearing in mind the interests of both the Organisation and its officials.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France) agreed that it made little difference whether the decision was taken now, and its implementation deferred, or whether it was postponed altogether. The Employers could agree to either, and they also agreed to the proposed formulation of the question to be put to the Administrative Tribunal.

Since the reply to be given would take the form of an opinion, that presumably meant that it would be binding only to the extent that the Governing Body undertook beforehand to accept it, whatever its scope or content.

There remained, moreover, a question of practical implementation, which would have to be the subject of further negotiations, and there was also the problem of the new survey, which would have to be carried out both speedily and impeccably. To that end it would have to be prepared carefully, with full participation of all the parties.

The Chairman said that if the Administrative Tribunal was to be consulted, each of the parties would have to accept its opinion as binding; otherwise there would be interminable procedural discussion and the opinion would serve no purpose. In other words, if the Governing Body agreed to accept the opinion as binding, it had a right to expect a similar commitment from the staff.

Mr. Mühr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) saw no reason not to accept the Director-General's suggestion. The Workers were prepared to do so and they hoped that in May a decision acceptable to all could be reached, especially as it would have been reached in accordance with the principles the ILO had always stood for.
Mr. Raghupathi (Government, India) wished to know the terms on which staff would be recruited for the Conference, if the decision was to be adjourned until May.

The Director-General replied that the staff in question were short-term, indeed very short-term staff, recruited strictly for the Conference and whose contracts would be based on the new scale in accordance with what the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee had apparently agreed.

Mr. Beantragoon (Government, Thailand) observed that the Governing Body was in a most difficult situation as it had to strike a balance between obligations arising out of treasured ILO principles and the need for ensuring the survival of the Organisation in its financial crisis. He supported the Director-General's suggestion that an opinion should be sought from the Administrative Tribunal. He hoped that consultations with the Staff Union would continue with a view to reaching a solution compatible both with the decision of the General Assembly and the principles of the ILO.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) supported the Director-General's suggestion on the understanding that the Tribunal's opinion would be binding.

Without prejudice to the position taken by Mexico in the General Assembly in December 1977 when Resolution No. XXXII/200 had been adopted, she wished to make it clear that her country attached the greatest importance to collective bargaining and conciliation, which were basic elements of social policy.

In his statement the Staff Union representative had drawn attention to variations in the application of the common system at Geneva, where the practices differed from one international organisation to another. As the efficiency of the ILO staff was widely recognised it would be useful if, perhaps between now and the month of May, the Union could provide particulars of employment conditions in other organisations. It would help to know whether working hours were different, salaries higher and the increment and promotion system better elsewhere. If ILO officials were treated differently from those of other organisations, the Governing Body should be told.

Mr. Azimi (Government, Iran) supported the Director-General's proposal that the Administrative Tribunal should be asked for an opinion on the points he had mentioned and that the Governing Body should postpone its decision until May. That would make for a soundly based decision and, between now and the month of May, provide an opportunity for consultations between the Administration and the Staff Union.

Mr. Polîtes (Employer, Australia) observed that the Governing Body was deferring a difficult decision by asking another body for advice. That might well be the right course, but what would the Governing Body do when it had the opinion before it? Under its normal procedure, as he understood it, the Administrative Tribunal could only make a definitive decision on an appeal; but in the present case it was being asked for an advisory opinion, and it was essential to know beforehand whether the Governing Body intended to accept that opinion in any event as binding and whether in return it had an assurance that it was similarly accepted by the Union; otherwise the same problem would arise again in May.

The Chairman understood that the Governing Body was prepared to accept the opinion and expected a concomitant undertaking from the Union. He noted that the Staff Union representative was acquiescing and concluded that the opinion given by the Administrative Tribunal would be accepted as binding by both parties.

Ms. Caron (Government, Canada) could not support the proposed deferral of the decision on the implementation of the International Civil Service Commission recommendation, which had been endorsed by the Programme, Budget and Administrative Committee and was already being implemented by the other specialised agencies in Geneva.

Mr. Sato (Government, Japan) associated himself with Ms. Caron's reservation. His own Government's position was reflected in the joint statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom Government in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee and that which he had made in the Governing Body.

In reply to a question from Mr. Raghupathi (Government, India), the Chairman said that, as he understood the position, the decision on paragraph 40 of the report
had been postponed altogether until the Administrative Tribunal's opinion was before the Governing Body, which would then, as its May session, reconsider in that light the wording of that paragraph, it being understood that the opinion of the Tribunal would be binding.

It was so agreed.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 43, 45 and 47 of the report.

Third Report

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) pointed out that in 1977 the Conference had requested the Director-General to draw up for 1978-79 new Programme and Budget proposals based on the resources available after the United States withdrawal, i.e. entailing a 25 per cent cut. The Director-General had in fact made proposals which the Governing Body had acted upon at its last two sessions but the balance had still not been fully restored. It was therefore necessary, despite the voluntary contributions - which were most welcome - to make further savings, especially in view of other factors such as persistent inflation, the continuing fall of the dollar against the Swiss franc and the presence of inactive member States within the Organisation.

The budget for 1978-79 currently showed a deficit of over $30 million and, like other countries, the USSR wished to know what the Director-General proposed to do to avoid an endless increase of Members' contributions.

Programme reductions should not, however, jeopardise activities designed to promote the interests of workers, such as technical co-operation, employment development, youth programs, strengthening of trade union rights and others.

On the other hand, research programmes might be reduced, or at least organised more rationally, and a fair number of non-essential publications might well be dropped. Administrative expenditure might also be reduced, for example on missions and formal entertainment. The secretariat for the last session of the Asian Advisory Committee had been perhaps somewhat overstuffed. Without in any way departing from the principle of tripartism, a smaller Governing Body delegation might be sent to the IMCO Conference to be held in London at the end of the year.

The United States having now withdrawn from membership, why should two ILO offices be kept on in that country, one in New York and one in Washington? The sale of publications - a function which any commercial firm could well perform - was not an adequate reason. What made the survival of those offices even odder was that the ILO was thinking of reducing staff in Moscow and other offices in Europe.

The policy of transferring vocational training staff to Turin was also questionable, and its legal and financial implications would have to be looked into before a decision was taken. In any event there had never been a greater need for savings and the scope for them was wide.

Mr. Kulpinski (Government, Poland) congratulated the Director-General on his persistent efforts to strike a balance between the various needs despite the present financial difficulties. The loss of a quarter of the budget would obviously affect programmes as a whole, but the ILO should take care to save what was essential and not detract from the role of the Conference, the body responsible for its whole future. The proposal for holding alternate "light" and "heavy" sessions of the Conference therefore seemed ill-advised.

It had been right, however, to seek to set criteria for staff reductions. Those criteria should take into account not only professional competence but also the need for fair geographical distribution, which at present did not exist, some countries and groups of countries being chronically under-represented.

Care should also be taken to maintain the activities which best met the needs of the working class. The ILO now had an opportunity to drop activities which deserved low priority or were of little interest, such as certain technical meetings devoted to research that did not truly reflect the concerns of member States.
The ILO should concentrate on such activities as preparing new instruments or revising outdated Conventions and Recommendations so as to promote employment and improve working conditions and environment, particularly for vulnerable groups such as women.

It should also set about carrying out work under PIACI and intensify activities in Europe, particularly relations and information work, and so strengthen the spirit of cooperation and understanding between European countries. The other regions might, in turn, stand to gain from such experience.

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) confirmed the remarks attributed to him in paragraph 34 of the report. In the eleventh line of the Spanish text, however, the word "inadequadas" should be replaced by "insuficientes". In speaking on this matter he had had in mind paragraph 8 of the Office paper, which stated that the Director-General was thinking of making internal savings to bridge the gap between the existing deficit and the decline in the value of the dollar in relation to the Swiss franc. His Government had consistently advocated internal savings.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 53 of the report.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) stressed the importance of the proposals concerning the running of the Conference, which in his view called for careful study. Conference sessions were indeed a heavy burden on the budget and some streamlining was needed to make them less costly. On the other hand, the Conference was the supreme ILO organ, representatives of all member States took part in its work, and it was the body which took the most important decisions. In trying to reduce expenditure care should therefore be taken not to impair its effectiveness and that was just what might happen if the Director-General's proposals were accepted.

First, standard setting was one of the Conference's main tasks, and endorsing the suggestion for making every other session a "light" one might mean putting off the adoption of certain standards for years. Secondly, the proposal for reducing the maximum length of speeches from 15 to 10 minutes seemed somewhat undemocratic. It would put a restriction on the rights of delegates and in any case it was for the Conference itself to take a decision on the matter. Lastly, the proposal for introducing a summary record was also not very democratic and might not even bring about savings since, if a statement had been distorted, the summary record would have to be revised, at further expense.

In short, the need to cut expenditure should not serve as a pretext for introducing undemocratic procedures which would remain in force even when the financial difficulties were over and which would restrict delegates' rights without even making the work any easier.

Mr. Nubt (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) said that it was indeed the Conference which should take decisions which concerned it. It might, however, be invited to look into certain questions and perhaps to accept one of the suggestions put to it. The Workers had expressed misgivings on the subject which were recorded in the Committee's report, but there did not seem to be anything dangerous or undemocratic about making proposals to the Conference which it was free to accept or reject.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France) felt that it was time to think about ways of streamlining the work of the Conference and the Governing Body, not with the guileful purpose of curtailing or enlarging the competence of any body, but so as to increase efficiency and make savings.

Shortening speeches was unfortunately the only specific proposal which had come out of the Committee's lengthy discussions, but it should be given serious and objective study and not be thought to have any ulterior political motive. After ten minutes attention did tend to wander and a speech that lasted any longer made less impact. The proposal was therefore one the Conference should welcome.

Moreover, if speeches lasted 15 minutes, not all those who wanted to take part in the discussion of the Director-General's report could do so unless meetings were held outside normal hours, for example in the evening or on Saturday afternoon. At such times the audience was fairly small and it was not very satisfactory for speakers to face an almost empty hall. Perhaps if speakers themselves agreed to give shorter speeches more of them would find a larger audience.
Mr. Kocsis (Government, Hungary) said that, for the reasons it had explained in the Committee, his Government was not in favour of imposing shorter speeches at the Conference and was therefore opposed to the recommendation in paragraph 78 of the report.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) was also opposed to reducing the length of speeches. The ILO could hardly invite ministers from all over the world to Geneva and then tell them they could speak for only ten minutes. What was at stake was not democracy; it was just a matter of proper organisation. There were surely other ways of saving time and money. For example, sittings could be made to start on time and not an hour late, as they sometimes did, and less time need be given to certain formalities at the beginning of the session.

The Chairman observed that opinion was divided on the matter, but that the Governing Body was merely invited to submit a proposal for consideration to the Conference, which would take the final decision. There seemed to be a majority in favour of the suggestion and so there was no reason not to adopt the recommendation in paragraph 78 of the report.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) demurred. It did make a difference to the Conference whether the Governing Body made a recommendation by a large majority or by a slim one. In the present instance it was not even clear that there was a majority at all in favour of the proposal.

Miss González Martinez (Government, Mexico) agreed that it was not always easy to tell a minister that he could speak for only ten minutes, but a time limit had already been set at other conferences and there was nothing to prevent someone from circulating the full text of his speech.

If it adopted the recommendation in paragraph 78 of the report, the Governing Body would agree to submit the proposal to the Conference. But in the meantime other ideas might occur, such as imposing a ten-minute limit on speakers other than ministers and being even stricter with observers.

The Director-General had made a great effort to submit to the Governing Body a whole set of suggestions for streamlining the work and making savings. It was a pity that the lengthy discussion in the Committee had produced only the one proposal. Still, it was at least a start and if, pending other measures, sittings were made to begin on time and speeches were shortened, that would already save a great deal of time.

Mr. Azizi (Government, Iran) pointed out that the matter had already been debated at length in the Committee and many had then been clearly in favour of the proposal in the report. Indeed, it was the only point on which agreement had been reached. It would, of course, be discourteous to limit the time allowed to a minister attending the Conference, but at present the President did not stop a speech which went on beyond the 15 minutes allowed and presumably that practice would continue if the time allowed were reduced to ten minutes.

The Director-General observed that Mr. Oechslin had regretted the fact that in the end the recommendation under discussion was the only one the Committee had agreed on. But there were several other matters which had been held over, such as the introduction of a combined verbatim and summary record. In the circumstances it might be a good idea to take up again the suggestion for setting up a small working party to carry out a systematic review of the complex questions which rationalising the work of the Governing Body and the Conference raised. If that procedure was adopted, no formal decision would be taken on paragraph 78 and the matter would be examined later with all the others.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France) was not much in favour of that suggestion. There were already many working parties and the work to be done was not always fairly apportioned. Perhaps for the time being it would suffice to hold informal consultations.

The Chairman gathered that the Governing Body agreed to postpone its decision on paragraph 78 until the informal consultations had been completed.

It was so decided.

The Director-General pointed out that the figure in paragraph 92 of the report should be amended to take account of the voluntary contributions announced earlier that day. The figure should now read 4,021,172 dollars.
The Governing Body adopted the proposal in paragraph 92 of the report, as amended.

The sitting closed at 6.20 p.m.
MINUTES OF THE NINTH SITTING
(Friday, 3 March 1978, Morning)

The sitting opened at 10.15 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Morris.

FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

First Report of the Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations

Mrs. Bicks-March (Government, Liberia), speaking for the Government representatives of the countries of the Group of 77, said that they were in favour of introducing secret ballots at the Conference. The Conference itself would, of course, take the final decision and the proposed amendments, if necessary to facilitate the proceedings of the Conference, would be inserted in the Standing Orders only after all the relevant points had been examined.

The Group considered it preferable to await the results of the negotiations on this matter in the Working Party on Structure and in the Conference Committee on Structure. The question of the amendment of article 19 of the Conference Standing Orders should be deferred to a later session of the Governing Body, preferably the November 1978 session.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) expressed the Workers' support for the Committee's recommendations with regard both to the procedure for fixing the Conference agenda and to article 17 of the Governing Body Standing Orders. The introduction of secret ballots at the Conference had, in fact, first been suggested by the Workers. They naturally fully supported the idea and endorsed the views expressed in the Committee by the Government representative of Japan to the effect that secret ballots were one of the safeguards of democracy and would enhance the principle of tripartism. They found no difficulty, however, in agreeing to the postponement proposed by the Group of 77, while hoping that an appropriate recommendation would be worked out in November.

Paragraph 16 of the report mentioned the possibility or conflict between paragraph 6 of article 19, which provided for a record vote under certain conditions, and the proposed new paragraph 11, which provided for a secret ballot under similar conditions. The Committee on Standing Orders might perhaps look into this, at its November 1978 meeting, taking as its basis the procedure proposed for secret ballots.

Mr. Polites (Employer, Australia) expressed the Employers' support for the proposed decision on the fixing of the Conference agenda. Though not fully convinced of the need for the proposed amendments, they went along with them as representing a fair compromise between the groups on a question which gave rise to considerable difficulties. However, the Governing Body should take note of paragraphs 7 and 9 of the report, which recorded an agreement in the Committee that the choice between single and double discussion should be made before the final decision was taken on the Conference agenda.

With regard to the proposed amendments to article 17 of the Governing Body Standing Orders, some of the Employer members were less than satisfied with paragraph 13 of the report, which suggested that a single Government member might impose his will on the whole Governing Body. As, however, the final decision would rest with the Chairman, he would doubtless make it a point to act in accordance with the general desire of the Governing Body.

With regard to the question of secret ballots at the Conference, the Employers staunchly supported the proposed amendments in paragraph 20 of the report. While they could accept deferment for the reasons given by the Government representatives of the countries belonging to the Group of 77, they noted that in principle the concept of secret ballots at the Conference had been accepted.
The Employers would like the Committee to consider other voting matters mentioned in paragraph 19 of the report as well as the credentials procedure, as suggested elsewhere in the same paper.

Mr. Azimi (Government, Iran) drew attention to a typing error in paragraph 19 of the French text of the report.

Mr. Nolas (Government, Austria) was disappointed at the postponement of the decision on secret ballots, an idea which, it seemed, deserved the unhesitating support of all, out of respect for democratic rights. A decision should at least be taken in November.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 6 and 12 of the report, and postponed consideration of the question of secret ballots at the Conference to its November 1978 session.

Second Report of the Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations

Second Supplementary Report: Past practice concerning special inquiries with particular reference to human rights questions (Twenty-first item on the agenda)

Mr. González Izquierdo (Government, Cuba) wished to clarify the remarks attributed to him in paragraph 22 of the second report of the Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. He had indeed spoken in favour of direct contacts, subject to the consent of the government concerned. He was also pleased that the Committee of Experts intended to explore ways of improving its effectiveness.

The Cuban Government considered, however, that care should be taken to ensure that in any such study the Committee of Experts, when examining reports on the factual or legal situation submitted to it, took account of the socio-political conditions arising out of the different economic systems and of the varying stage of development of member States. Many countries had drawn attention to this point to no avail, and that had hampered efforts to achieve a solution in cases where it was difficult to judge the situation. Sending tripartite missions or an expert to the country concerned to investigate and solve the problems would serve no purpose and would only give rise to unnecessary expenditure if the conclusions and recommendations were to be based solely on the letter of the standard or instrument alleged to have been violated.

Mr. Kaier (Worker, Austria) reaffirmed the Workers' position as reflected in paragraph 14 of the report of the Committee, where it was stated that, while they gave their unreserved support to the direct contacts procedure, they had some reservations with regard to missions carried out by members of the Committee of Experts. The group supported the proposals in paragraph 28 of the report.

Mr. Polites (Employer, Australia) merely wished to point out that his group's position was set out in paragraph 15 of the Committee's report and to add that the whole range of issues connected with standard setting and supervision must necessarily be governed by general principles of objectivity and impartiality.

The Employers supported the proposals in paragraph 28 of the report and hoped that the Committee would, when considering the matter further, look also into the questions dealt with in the second supplementary report of the Director-General.

Mr. Mühr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) noted from the second supplementary report, dealing with past practice concerning special inquiries with particular reference to human rights questions, that the ILO had a whole range of means at its disposal for supervising the implementation of standards. It should use them as effectively as possible, though clearly observance of those standards depended primarily on the political circumstances in the various countries.

The Director-General might continue to examine ways of improving the effectiveness of the machinery and report to the Governing Body at its next session. For that purpose, consideration might be given to two possibilities.
The first would be for reports concerning unratified Conventions and Recommendations to cover, at regular intervals, the entire group of instruments concerning human rights. That would enable the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations to take an over-all view of the situation. In the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards the reports would be subject to thorough discussion leading to concrete recommendations, particularly with regard to the human rights covered by the resolution concerning trade union rights and their relation to civil liberties adopted by the Conference in 1970.

The second possibility would be to extend to the other instruments on human rights the procedure applied in cases of discrimination and mentioned in paragraph 30 of the Director-General's second supplementary report. The employers' and workers' organisations of any member State could call for a special inquiry on the application in any given country of the standards laid down in the human rights instruments. A government could not refuse to submit to an inquiry on the ground that it had not ratified the standards in question, and if it did its refusal would be given appropriate publicity before further remedial action was contemplated.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 28 of the report of the Committee and took note of the Director-General's second supplementary report.

FIFTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the International Organisations Committee

Mr. Martor (Government, Hungary) introduced the report and asked the Governing Body to approve it. A large part of the discussions had been concerned with the policy of apartheid in South Africa, which, once again, had earned the unanimous condemnation of speakers. They had, moreover, called for increased support for the liberation movements fighting against apartheid and had welcomed the account given by the representative of the Director-General, Mr. Bolin, of the results already achieved by the ILO in this extremely important area.

The recommendations in the Committee's report were put forth unanimously.

Mr. Tata (Employer, India) associated himself with the preceding statement, particularly as regards the unanimous agreement among the three groups, though admittedly most of the papers before the Committee were merely information papers.

Mr. Franic (Government, Yugoslavia), referring to the special session of the United Nations General Assembly convened for 1980 to assess progress in the establishment of the new international economic order and to adopt a new international development strategy, expressed sympathy for the Worker members' concern, as recorded in paragraph 25 of the report, concerning a slowdown of the initial momentum and the appearance of certain misgivings with regard to the Programme of Action adopted by the World Employment Conference. As the Workers had said, a new effort was needed to get the message across that the Programme of Action was not simply concerned with satisfying basic needs or achieving marginal improvements in nutrition, medicine, housing and education, but included other basic objectives such as full employment, fair income distribution and world-wide respect for trade union rights. As the Workers had pointed out, ECOSOC at its 63rd Session had adopted a resolution affirming that the new international development strategy should be directed towards the establishment of the new international economic order.

The Government of Yugoslavia considered it of the utmost importance that every possibility should be explored in pursuing the goals of the ILO Programme of Action and in defining the ILO's role in the formulation of the new international development strategy.

Mr. Ben-Israel (Worker, Israel) said that the Workers welcomed the Economic and Social Council resolution on a unified approach to development analysis and planning and hoped that the efforts of the United Nations specialised agencies would be translated into concrete action. He was also gratified that ECOSOC had given
rural problems and those of migrant workers the attention they deserved. Respect for the dignity and rights of migrant workers was a matter whose importance could not be overstressed. When a migrant worker had found a job in a host country he should be entitled to the same rights as national workers, and for that ratification and implementation of ILO Conventions in as many countries as possible was the first condition.

The Workers were alarmed at the deteriorating situation in South Africa, where under the new laws non-Whites who were out of work for a certain period were liable to punishment. The ILO and the other United Nations specialised agencies should spare no effort, particularly in the year of the struggle against apartheid, to have these discriminatory laws repealed.

With regard to the structure of the United Nations system, the Workers' group would welcome any new co-ordination measure which would help to avoid duplication. Efforts were apparently being made to find a middle road between co-ordination and centralisation. The impact of tripartism must not, however, be lost through the ILO being the only tripartite member of a single executive body directing all operational activities. Governments—with all due respect to them—had not been very successful in solving the economic and social problems of the world and the situation might improve if workers' and employers' organisations had more say in other United Nations bodies and in national missions to those bodies.

With regard to the World Employment Conference, the Workers very much appreciated the efforts made by the Director-General and Mr. Bolin to promote understanding of and support for the Conference's objectives. Undoubtedly in the months after the Conference the Declaration of Principles and Programme of Action had been well received by world opinion, but, as Mr. Franic had said, the momentum had slowed down. If the ILO wished to succeed in the fight against unemployment, the Programme of Action would have to become an integral part of over-all development strategy; and that called for fairer distribution of income and wealth, respect for trade union rights and labour standards, and not merely the satisfaction of basic needs. The latter, by the way, far from being just another slogan, was already embodied as a basic principle in various international labor standards and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Further efforts would, it was to be hoped, lead to a revival of interest in the Programme of Action so that it could become a really effective tool in the struggle against unemployment.

Mr. Lombera Pallares (Government, Mexico) fully shared the views of the Worker member whose statement was summarised in paragraph 35 of the report. The Mexican Government attached great importance to questions of food, in view of their close link with the basic needs strategy and the fight against unemployment, and it fully appreciated the importance of the Manila Communiqué of the Third Ministerial Session of the World Food Council.

Unfortunately, the Committee had not had enough time to give thorough consideration to the matters before it; yet the contacts with other United Nations bodies which it was meant to develop were especially essential in today's critical situation.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 38, 42 and 45 of the report.

SEVENTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Activities of the International Occupational Safety and Health Information Centre (CIS) in 1977

Mr. Gachalin (Employer, France) expressed the Employers' keen interest in the Centre's activities and noted the remarkable increase in its extra-budgetary revenue and particularly in the sales of its publications. Over and above these purely financial results, the continuing interest of CIS subscribers was especially gratifying. The Employers were extremely pleased at the way in which the Centre was managed and assured it of their full support.
Mr. Foqarty (Government, Australia), referring to the Appendix to the Office paper, said that for Australia the name of the department indicated should be "Department of Employment and Industrial Relations".

The Governing Body took note of the Office paper.

EIGHTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings

First paper

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France), referring to Part II of the paper, asked for further details concerning the Workers' Education Seminar for Workers' Education Instructors and Administrators from Zambia and Southern Africa. Noting that it was intended to convene only senior government officials for the Seminar on National and International Labour Standards for Latin American Countries, he observed that even if that could be justified in this instance a tripartite composition was, as a rule, preferable for meetings of this kind.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General), taking up Mr. Oechslin's second remark, said that the seminar formed part of a programme of activities aimed at giving labour ministry officials a better understanding of their responsibilities regarding the application of ILO standards. Obviously there was a need for similar action with regard to workers' and employers' representatives, and separate seminars had indeed been organised for them in the past under the relevant programmes.

The Workers' Education Seminar for Workers' Education Instructors and Administrators from Zambia and Southern Africa was intended to meet the workers' education needs of Southern African liberation movements and to promote the development of trade union organisations in the territories concerned. Participants were selected in consultation with the liberation movements.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France) found the information provided on the composition of the Inter-regional Round Table on the Relationship between Labour Law, Labour Relations and Development vague and ambiguous. He noted that the meeting was confined to participants from developing regions and doubted whether that approach was the right one. As the Employers had already pointed out on previous occasions, participants in meetings of that kind learned much more from one another than from the lecturers provided for them, and the presence of some participants from industrialised countries might make the exercise more worthwhile.

He reaffirmed the Employers' interest in the African Regional Seminar on Management Training for Small Contractors and asked that the employers' organisations of the countries concerned should be directly consulted in the nomination of the representatives of building enterprises who were to participate.

Mr. Kuhrt (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) regretted that two of the meetings mentioned in paragraph 46 of the Office paper were to be held in Montevideo. Uruguay ought to be kept out of ILO activities so long as it continued to ride roughshod over the basic standards of the Organisation and was the subject of continual complaints in the Committee on Freedom of Association.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France) pointed out that the meetings in question were organised by the Inter-American Vocational Training Research and Documentation Centre (CINTERFOR) which, regrettable though that might be, had its headquarters in Montevideo. CINTERFOR rendered valuable services both to the workers and to the employers of Latin America, all of whom had a stake in its success. The two meetings had to be held at the Centre for practical and financial reasons, and the Workers might perhaps in this case be prepared to accept the proposals made.

Mr. Kuhrt (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) paid tribute to the activities of CINTERFOR, which deserved to be supported and developed, but felt nevertheless that the best lesson that could be given to Uruguay was to question on principle the appropriateness of its being the headquarters of such bodies or of meetings being held there with ILO participation.
While it was not for the Governing Body to decide on the meetings in question, the Workers wished to make it clear to the Director-General that they could not understand the choice of such a location.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General), further to Mr. Gechsel's remarks, said that CINTERFOR was a Latin American institution which had been set up and financed largely by the national vocational training bodies in the region. Though closely associated with the ILO, it had its own governing council which decided on research programmes, advisory services and meetings. In those circumstances the Office could do little more than take note of the opinions expressed by the Worker members of the Governing Body.

Mr. Cairo Soler (Government, Cuba) pointed out that on the previous day, during the discussion on the reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association, the Cuban Government, echoing the Worker members, had stressed the need for stronger measures against countries which flagrantly violated trade union rights and urged that no ILO meetings should be held or ILO bodies set up in such countries.

In the same spirit, it now supported the Workers' group in opposing maintaining CINTERFOR headquarters in Montevideo and holding meetings in Uruguay. It did so not only for reasons of principle having to do with the defence of human rights, but also on the purely practical ground that when certain countries, including Cuba, wished to participate in CINTERFOR activities they were often refused visas.

Mr. Vilanes Famos (Employer, Mexico), speaking for the Latin American Employers, paid a tribute to CINTERFOR for its outstanding services. Disregarding any form of pressure and uninfluenced by its location, as was clear from the high quality of its publications, the Centre sponsored a wide range of activities and meetings. Not only was there no solid argument to support the view that meetings should not be held in Montevideo, but such a policy might prove counterproductive and set back the cause of freedom.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) asked what exactly was meant by modular vocational training, on which a meeting was to be held.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) said that the ILO had been doing a great deal of work on modular training, which consisted in a breakdown of the whole training process into groups of employable skills, not only in conceptualising that approach but through the preparation of training packages in the form of small modules which could be put together in any way the market might need. The method had been widely used in certain Asian countries and in the Middle East, and the meeting in question would consider ways of introducing it in Latin America.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 3 and 8 of the Office paper.

Second paper

The Governing Body adopted the proposal in paragraph 7 of the paper.

TWENTY-FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) paid tribute to the memory of his colleague and friend, Charles Kuntschen, who had given much of his time to the ILO over a period of 36 years, being, for 18 of those years, a member of the Governing Body. During that period he had been head of the Swiss Employers' delegation at each session of the Conference, where he had given proof of his ability as the Employers' spokesman on the Credentials Committee, the Standing Orders Committee and other committees, combining wide experience with great human qualities, tolerance, understanding and an unswerving devotion to the Organisation, its ideals and principles.
The Governing Body would certainly wish to ask the Director-General to convey its condolences to the family of Charles Kuntschen and to the Central Federation of Swiss Employers' Associations. The Employers had been represented at the funeral in Sion by Mr. Pierre Waline, one of the most eminent members of their group.

Mr. Nuhé (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) said that the Workers shared the sorrow and sense of loss expressed by Mr. Bergenström. They were deeply grateful to Charles Kuntschen for all his services to the Organisation and would like the Director-General to convey their condolences to his family and to the Central Federation of Swiss Employers' Associations.

Mr. Ago (Government, Italy) had had the pleasure of working with Charles Kuntschen over the years and appreciating his outstanding qualities, competence and courtesy. He associated the Government group with the sorrow of the Employers' group and with the condolences to be sent to the family.

The Director-General joined in paying tribute to Charles Kuntschen, whom he had known for many years and had held in high esteem.

He and the other members of the Office staff had felt keen sorrow on learning of the death of Mr. Hugh Jones on 16 January at the age of 48.

Hugh Jones, a British subject, had served on the staff for 18 years. He had been a first-class interpreter at Governing Body sessions and at various meetings. He had then served in the Official Relations Branch and had there helped in producing papers for the Governing Body and its Officers. In recent years he had also played an important though discreet role in the Resolutions Committee of the Conference. He would be remembered as a man of unusual qualities, remarkable intelligence and competence, integrity, dedication and warmth of character.

Mr. Bergengrüm (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) associated the Employer members with the tribute paid to Hugh Jones, who had had many friends in their group. The Employers had been deeply sorry to hear of the death of one they had held in such high regard and offered deep sympathy to his family.

Mr. Nuhé (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) associated the Workers with the sympathy expressed. Many of the Workers had worked with Hugh Jones and come to appreciate his great qualities. They would like the Director-General to convey their condolences to his family.

Mr. Ago (Government, Italy) associated the Government group with the expression of condolences.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 6 and 10 of the report.

First Supplementary Report

Procedure for the appointment of Conference Committees

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 3 and 4 of the report.

Second Supplementary Report

Past practice concerning special inquiries with particular reference to human rights questions

The Chairman pointed out that the second supplementary report had been
discussed at the beginning of the sitting together with the report of the Committee on Standing Orders.¹

**Third Supplementary Report**

**Governing Body delegation to the International Conference on Training and Certification of Seafarers to be convened by IMCO**

**Eleventh Supplementary Report**

**Nominations for the Governing Body delegation to the International Labour Conference on Training and Certification of Seafarers to be convened by IMCO**

Mr. Mühr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) said that the Workers wished to see even fuller account taken of tripartisism at the IMCO conference and therefore asked the Director-General to discuss with IMCO the possibility of nominating an Employer and a Worker as vice-presidents. The Workers also intended to send an appropriate number of technical advisers to accompany their delegates to the conference.

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that, because the subjects of direct concern to the ILO were so important, it had been agreed that the ILO delegation should be large enough for the principle of tripartisism to be reflected even in the work of the technical committees. But it was necessary to go even further, and the Director-General should seek to have the ILO delegates to the Conference given the status, not of observers, but of full participants with, for example, the possibility of appointment as vice-presidents of committees.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) said that the Director-General had already consulted IMCO on the exact nature of participation by the ILO, whose delegation would enjoy a privileged position and would be able to take part in all committee debates.

The appointment of Employer and Worker members of the ILO delegation as vice-presidents was not in keeping with the standing orders of IMCO conferences. But in view of the further comments made the matter would again be raised with the Secretary-General of IMCO and everything would be done to enable the ILO delegation to play a decisive part at the conference.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 5 of the Third Supplementary Report and approved the nominations in paragraphs 2 to 5 of the Eleventh Supplementary Report.

**Fourth Supplementary Report**

**First Report of the Officers of the Governing Body: Incomplete delegations at tripartite meetings**

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the Employers set great store by this matter and, though willing to concur in the points for decision, thought it inadequate just to take note of what was an unsatisfactory state of affairs. The Office should, in their view, look into the whole problem and at some future session make practical proposals to the Governing Body for solving it.

¹ See above, pp. IX/2-3.
Mr. Huhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) said that the Workers, too, had studied the Office paper with care and were sorry to see that in many cases the rule of tripartism was disregarded — usually through the fault of governments.

So as to provide a remedy for the consequences, the Workers' group would like to see Article 4(2) of the Constitution amended. According to that article, a non-Government delegate lost his right to vote when his opposite number in the other group was absent, whereas the Government, which was usually to blame kept its right to vote. There was a further injustice in the final outcome of voting in that the balance was thus upset and governments carried greater weight than the Employers and Workers. If in such cases Government delegates were to lose their right to vote, not only would an injustice be removed but governments would be given an incentive to send complete delegations.

Mr. Griffin (Government, Venezuela) explained that the reason why Venezuela had failed to send Employer or Worker delegates to the 62nd (Maritime) Session of the Conference was of course not any disrespect for tripartism but simply matters of internal organisation. A bad precedent had been set which would serve as a lesson, and similar omissions would not recur.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), taking up what Mr. Muhr had said, observed that at a plenary sitting of the Conference in 1977 he had himself expressed regret that governments which sent incomplete delegations had the right to vote. He suggested that the study which Mr. Bergenström had asked the Office to carry out should contain specific proposals for amending the relevant provisions.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) said that, as regards the Tripartite Technical Meeting for Civil Aviation, the Government of Mexico had written to the Director-General explaining that the Employer delegates had been unable to leave Mexico because they had been engaged in important collective bargaining. She hoped that that reply would appear in the next paper on the matter.

Delegates to the 62nd (Maritime) Session of the Conference and the Ninth Session of the Iron and Steel Committee had failed to attend because they had been unable to do so. Her Government regretted its failure to provide explanations — an omission which would be made good in a few weeks' time.

Mr. Ago (Government, Italy) said that the purpose of the report was not to point out the omissions of any particular country but to the disturbing frequency of such omissions. If delegations were incomplete the Organisation might in practice lose its tripartite character. Measures should therefore be considered to put an end to this, in line with the wishes expressed by the Workers' and Employers' groups.

Mr. Ogan (Government, Somalia), after having congratulated the Director-General on his re-election and expressed confidence that he would do his utmost in the service of the Organisation, of mankind in general, and, in particular, of the people of the developing countries, said that his Government attached great importance to tripartism and sent complete delegations to the sessions of the Conference. Unfortunately for financial reasons it could not send such delegations to meetings convened with technical questions of a narrower and more specific nature, such as the 62nd (Maritime) Session of the Conference, but it hoped to be more successful in future.

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon) observed that the report on incomplete delegations met a request from the Employers' and Workers' groups, which were concerned at the many departures from the principle of tripartism. Obviously the report itself was not enough to put matters right and that was why an amendment to the Constitution had just been suggested. But such an amendment might take a long time and in the meantime not only should the Office continue to ask governments why they had not complied with the rule but it should send one or even two reminders to any which failed to answer the invitation addressed to them to appoint delegates. That might be the way to correct what in many cases was just an oversight and not due to any real unwillingness.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the report.
Fifth Supplementary Report

Representation presented by the World Federation of
Trade Unions under Article 24 of the Constitution
alleging non-observance of the Discrimination
(Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958
(No. 111), by the Federal Republic of Germany

The Chairman proposed that the Governing Body appoint a committee, in
accordance with the recommendation in paragraph 4 of the report.

It was so decided.

Mr. Ago (Government, Italy) proposed the reappointment of the committee which
had already examined a similar question.

On the proposal of the groups, the Governing Body decided to appoint Mr.
Griffin (Government member), Mr. Polites (Employer member) and Mr. Maier (Worker
member) as members of the committee.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 5 of the report.

Sixth Supplementary Report

Third Report of the Officers of the Governing Body;
Members of chief industrial importance

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the
Governing Body should, as invited by its Officers, ask the Director-General at once
to submit to it proposals for the appointment of the proposed committee, whose
report could then be made available when the Governing Body elections took place
during the Conference.

Mr. Azimi (Government, Iran) pointed out that an amendment to Article 7 of the
Constitution aimed at abolishing the non-elective seats on the Governing Body was
one of the main questions being considered by the Working Party on Structure, which
also had before it proposals relating to the criteria for identifying the countries
of chief industrial importance. It might be hoped that on that basis a compromise
solution would be reached, and in the circumstances resort to a committee as
proposed would seem at best premature.

Moreover, at a time when the return of the United States to the Organisation
at the earliest possible date was hoped for, measures to fill hastily the seat
which they had vacated would seem premature. He therefore proposed that consider­
ation of the matter should be postponed.

Mr. Osman (Government, Somalia) associated himself with Mr. Azimi's views.

Mr. Nuhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) said that the Workers' group
had accepted the Officers' recommendation, but they could agree to a postponement if
the Government group so desired, since it was mainly a matter for the governments to
fill the vacant seats in their ranks.

Mr. Griffin (Government, Venezuela) said that, in line with the position
consistently taken by his Government in the Working Party on Structure, he was
naturally in favour of postponing examination of this matter and, indeed, postponing
it until a number of other questions of structure had been discussed.

The Chairman said that the Officers had considered it their duty to make
proposals on this matter but that the Government group was free to postpone the
decision since the vacant seat was primarily a matter for the Government group.

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) agreed that it was
the duty of the Officers of the Governing Body to make the proposal. The Employers
wished to have time to meet and consider the proposal for postponement. The new provisions under consideration in the Working Party on Structure could not in any event come into force before 1981 and in the meantime the proper rules should be followed.

Mr. Ago (Government, Italy) pointed out that asking experts to name the tenth member State of chief industrial importance did not necessarily amount to a decision to fill the vacancy.

It might be awkward to postpone the question since, if for some reason the Governing Body decided to fill the vacant seat, it would be unable to do so for want of the necessary data.

Due haste in the matter would be ill-advised — not for the reason given by Mr. Azimi and other speakers — but because it was desirable not to replace the United States at once and there was hope that it would return as soon as possible to the Organisation. Even though there was a fairly good chance of reaching agreement on the new text of Article 7 in the Working Party on Structure, the present text was still in force and there was no question of proceeding as if it had already been repealed.

Mr. Gomes Chiarelli (Government, Brazil) considered it out of the question that the Governing Body should refuse to abide by the constitutional rules because it supposedly contained a majority made up of those who did not want to fill the seat left vacant by the United States and those who said that Article 7 of the Constitution had to be amended.

It was of course important and wholly desirable that the United States should return to membership, but that country had left after giving two years' notice, i.e. in compliance with the provisions of the Constitution, and obviously membership would always remain open to it. The ILO Constitution and the Standing Orders of the Governing Body were there to lay down the provisions governing its return. The reform of structure was also very important but it would be long before any agreement in the Working Party led to an amendment of the Constitution. The two arguments put forward in favour of postponement were therefore unsound.

Moreover, to let things go on as at present would be directly at odds with several provisions of the Constitution. Thus in Article 7 it was laid down in the first paragraph that the Governing Body consisted of 56 persons, 28 representing governments, and in the second paragraph that, of the 28 persons representing governments, ten should be appointed by the Members of chief industrial importance. It was even questionable whether the decisions now being taken by the Governing Body were quite valid, since its composition did not conform with the rules, and, as time went by, that anomaly would become less and less acceptable.

According to another provision, any amendment to the Constitution required the votes of at least five of the ten Members of chief industrial importance. Supposing the problem arose right now, what procedure would be followed? Would the minimum required still be five, even though, with one seat vacant, the proportions would no longer be right? It was clearly a matter of urgency to return to full observance of the provisions of the Constitution.

The Chairman considered that there was no question about the validity of the decisions at present taken by the Governing Body. It had not hitherto had the time to fill the seat and, as for the immediate future, it was master of its own proceedings and could either take a decision now or postpone it.

Mr. Griffin (Government, Venezuela) felt that the arguments just put forward might have been convincing had they been heard when China had made clear its intention of not taking part in the work of the Organisation, or just after the United States had left. But now they just looked like an attempt by a few countries which wanted to join the ranks of the privileged to keep an outdated system going, against the wishes of the majority, which wanted to see more democracy in the ILO. That so much time had been allowed to go by since the abstention of China and even the withdrawal of the United States was no reason for allowing a privilege and overlooking the proposals under discussion in the Working Party on Structure which were aimed at making the Organisation more democratic.

The Government of Venezuela was therefore for the time being strongly opposed to setting up the committee.
Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) said that her country, which was a member of the Working Party on Structure, was anxious to see it make progress. But now there was a seat on the Governing Body vacated by a State which had left the Organisation, as well as an unoccupied seat belonging to a Member which had only recently announced that it would not take part in the Organisation's work.

Was it right for an important body like the Governing Body to carry on with only 26 instead of 28 Government members? That was an anomaly and the Director-General should carefully look into the legal position and report his conclusions at the next session.

As to the Officers' proposal, it would perhaps be easier to wait until May and, in the light of the progress achieved on structure, perhaps ask the Director-General to make the proposals referred to in paragraph 6 of the report, since sooner or later the vacancy would have to be filled.

Mr. Osman (Government, Somalia) reminded the Governing Body that it had before it a formal proposal for adjournment. In view of the importance of the matter, no relevant question should be settled without proper consultation of all interested parties. Besides, much progress had been made in the matter by the Working Party on Structure, and so it was only right to await the outcome.

The Legal Adviser might perhaps be asked what was actually meant by a "member State of chief industrial importance". Was the idea to be taken literally, i.e. to mean what had been intended when it had been introduced into the Constitution? Might the term not rather be given a liberal and progressive interpretation so that, account being taken of world developments, it need not apply only to countries of Europe and North America but to those of the other continents as well?

The discussion was adjourned to the following sitting.

The sitting closed at 1:15 p.m.


TENTH SITTING
(Friday, 3 March 1978, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.15 p.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Morris.

TWENTY-FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General

Sixth Supplementary Report (concl.)¹

Third Report of the Officers of the
Governing Body: Members of chief
industrial importance

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the Employers were willing to endorse the proposal made at the ninth sitting for postponing consideration of the matter. They believed, however, that the Constitution should be strictly applied: that meant that the ten member States of chief industrial importance should be determined before the Government electoral college elected the other 18 Government members of the Governing Body. According to the principle of group autonomy it was primarily the responsibility of the Government group to settle the matter.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) endorsed Mr. Bergenström's remarks. The Workers, too, believed that, though the responsibility lay with the Government group, the provisions of the Constitution must be adhered to. Consideration of the matter might be postponed to the next session.

It was so agreed.

Seventh Supplementary Report

Participation of international organisations in the 64th (1978) Session of the Conference

Mr. Ahmed (Government, Sudan) asked what item on the Conference's agenda the European Organisation of Military Associations, mentioned in paragraph 6 of the report, was interested in.

The Director-General replied that it had expressed an interest in the item on freedom of association in the public service.

The Governing Body adopted the proposals in paragraphs 3 and 7 of the report.

¹ See ninth sitting.
X/ 2

Eighth Supplementary Report

Fourth Report of the Officers of the Governing Body: Tripartite meeting on apartheid to be held within the framework of the Conference at its 64th (1978) Session

Mr. Bergenström (Employer, Sweden; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the Employers fully supported the proposal for holding the tripartite meeting on apartheid, a subject of acute concern and an especially topical one since 1978 was the International Year against Apartheid.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 5 of the report.

Ninth Supplementary Report

Participation of non-metropolitan territories as observers in the 64th (1978) Session of the International Labour Conference

The Governing Body adopted the proposal in paragraph 3 of the report.

Tenth Supplementary Report

Composition of the Organisation

The Governing Body took note of the report.

Report of the Officers of the Governing Body: Reconstitution of panels of consultants

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 6 of the report.

TWENTY-SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Programme of meetings

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) proposed, on behalf of the Workers, that a meeting of the European members and deputy members of the Governing Body should take place during the June 1978 session of the Conference to determine the agenda for the Third European Regional Conference and report to the Governing Body at its 207th Session. The meeting should be held after the Governing Body elections since it was the newly elected Governing Body that would be concerned with arrangements for the European Conference.

It was so agreed.

The Governing Body adopted the proposals in paragraphs 6 and 11 of the Office paper.

The session was declared closed at 3.40 p.m.

Report postponed from the 204th Session.
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LISTE ALPHABETIQUE DES PERSONNES PRESENTES A LA SESSION
ALPHABETICAL LIST OF PERSONS ATTENDING THE SESSION
LISTA POR ORDEN ALFABETICO DE LAS PERSONAS PRESENTES EN LA REUNION

---

G = Représentant gouvernemental - Government representative - representante gubernamental
E = Membre employeur - employer member - miembro empleador
T = Membre travailleur - worker member - miembro trabajador
GS = Suppléant gouvernemental - Government substitute - suplente gubernamental
ES = Suppléant employer - employer substitute - suplente empleador
GCT = Conseiller technique gouvernemental - Government adviser - consejero técnico gubernamental
ECT = Conseiller technique employeur - employer adviser - consejero técnico empleador
TCT = Conseiller technique travailleur - worker adviser - consejero técnico trabajador
GA = Représentant gouvernemental (membre adjoint) - Government representative (deputy member) - representante gubernamental (miembro adjunto)
EA = Membre employeur adjoint - employer deputy member - miembro empleador adjunto
TA = Membre travailleur adjoint - worker deputy member - miembro trabajador adjunto
GAS = Suppléant gouvernemental (membre adjoint) - Government substitute (deputy member) - suplente gubernamental (miembro adjunto)
CACT = Conseiller technique gouvernemental (membre adjoint) - Government adviser (deputy member) - consejero técnico gubernamental (miembro adjunto)
EACT = Conseiller technique employeur (membre adjoint) - employers' adviser (deputy member) - consejero técnico empleador (miembro adjunto)
TACT = Conseiller technique travailleur (membre adjoint) - workers' adviser (deputy member) - consejero técnico trabajador (miembro adjunto)
GNM = Représentant d'un gouvernement non Membre - representative of a non-Member Government - representante de un gobierno no Miembro
IO = Représentant d'une organisation internationale gouvernementale - representative of an international governmental organisation - representante de una organización internacional gubernamental
ONG = Représentant d'une organisation internationale non gouvernementale - representative of an international non-governmental organisation - representante de una organización internacional no gubernamental
AGO, Roberto, M., professeur de droit international, Université de Rome; représentant du gouvernement de l'Italie au Conseil d'administration; vice-président gouvernemental du Conseil d'administration, (Italie).


E AHMED, I.M., Mr. (Sudan), Executive Director, Sudanese Businessmen and Employers' Federation.

TA AHMED, K., Mr. (Pakistan), General Secretary, All Pakistan Federation of Trade Unions.

G AHMED, Osman Mohamed, Mr., Director-General, Department of Labour, Ministry of Public Service and Administrative Reform, (Sudan).

GS AL-AWADHI, Abdul Hamid, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Kuwait in Geneva, (Kuwait).

GNM ALBALATE LAFITA, Joaquin, Sr., agregado para Asuntos Sociales, Misión Permanente de España en Ginebra, (España).

GACT ALDEA, Mircea, M., troisième secrétaire, Mission permanente de la République socialiste de Roumanie à Genève, (Roumanie).

OI AL-DEZIK, Akram, H.E., Ambassador, Permanent Representative in Geneva, (League of Arab States).

GS AL-HANAN, Anna Rashid, Miss, Division of International Organisations and Conferences, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour, (Kuwait).

EA AL-JASEM, A., Mr. (Kuwait), Assistant Secretary, Kuwait Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

G ALLASSOUNOUMA, B., M., ministre du Travail et de la Fonction publique, (Togo).


GAS AMARO POURCIEL, Eduardo, Sr., Asesor del Ministerio de Trabajo, (Argentine).

ONG ANGELI de, Carlos, M., représentant permanent à Genève, (Fédération syndicale mondiale).

OI ARIK, Umcet, Mr., Principal Administrator, Private Office of the Secretary-General, (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development).

EA ASPOUR, Walid, Mr. (Jordan), President, Amman Chamber of Industry.

GCT ASHTON, R.H.J., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva, (United Kingdom).

GCT AVRAM, Daniel, M., conseiller juridique, ministère des Affaires étrangères, (France).

G AZIMI, Sadegh, S.E., ambassadeur; Mission permanente de l'Iran à Genève; représentant du gouvernement de l'Iran au Conseil d'administration, (Iran).

ONG BACCOOCHE, Habib, M., assistant du secrétaire général, (Organisation internationale des employeurs).

GS BANGOURA, Mamouna, M., Directeur général du travail, (Guinée).

EA BANNERMAN-MENSON, F., Mr. (Ghana), Executive Director, Ghana Employers' Association.

GCT BARBADO ARROIO, Raymundo Guilherme, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente del Brasil en Ginebra, (Brasil).

GAS BAREMWEGUE, P., M., conseiller chargé des affaires sociales et culturelles, premier ministère et ministère du Plan, (Burundi).
GNM  BARROMI, Joel, H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Israel in Geneva, (Israel).

GA  BASRI, Chairul, Mr., Secretary General, Department of Manpower, Transmigration and Co-operatives, (Indonesia).

GNM  BAYARTE, Luvsandorjin, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Mongolian People's Republic in Geneva, (Mongolia).

TA  BEN ISRAEL, Gidon, Mr. (Israel), member, Executive Bureau, Histadrut (Federation of Labour in Israel).

GNM  BENITO MESTRE, Fernando, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de España en Ginebra, (España).

EA  BENJAMIN, A.E., Mr. (Sierra Leone), Executive Officer, Sierra Leone Employers' Federation.

E  BERGENSTRÖM, Gullmar, Mr. (Sweden), Chairman, International Council of the Danish, Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish Employers' Confederation; Vice-Chairman of the Governing Body.

EACT  BERNABEI, G.C., M., accompagnant M. Polese.

G  BINTU'a-Tshiabola, S.E., Ambassadeur; Représentant permanent du Zaïre à Genève, (Zaire).

GNM  BOCETA, Maria Rosa, Srta., secretario de Embajada, Misión Permanente de España en Ginebra, (España).

GAS  BOLLANGA, Samuel, M., administrateur du travail, ministère du Travail, (République-Unie du Cameroun).

GCT  BORDADINE, Afanassy Fedorovitch, M., chef de la Division des relations internationales, Comité d'État du travail et des questions sociales du Conseil des ministres de l'URSS, (URSS).

GNM  BORG, Saviour F., Mr., Acting Permanent Delegate, Permanent Mission of Malta in Geneva, (Malta).

GNM  BOUVIN, Ake, Mr., Chief Legal Officer, Ministry of Labour, (Sweden).

GAS  BRECKENRIDGE, K.K., Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka in Geneva, (Sri Lanka).

GNM  BRIKI, Yahia, M., conseiller, Mission permanente de la République algérienne démocratique et populaire à Genève, (Algérie).

GCT  BRUAAS, Odd, Mr., Counsellor, International Relations Division, Ministry of Social Affairs, (Norway).

GCT  BUCHSBAUM, Roger, M., administrateur civil, Division des relations internationales, ministère du Travail, (France).

OI  BUENO do PRADO, F., Mr., Chief, Research and International Agency Liaison Unit, (Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration).

GNM  CABALLERO TAMAYO, Xavier, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de Bolivia en Ginebra, (Bolivia).

GACT  CAIRO SOLER, Alfredo, Sr., funcionario, Dirección de Organismos Internacionales, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, (Cuba).

GACT  CANKUR, Rashid, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Turkey in Geneva, (Turkey).

GNM  CANO de SANTAYANA, Antonio, Sr., subdirector general de Asuntos Sociales, Ministerio de Trabajo, (España).

GS  CARON, Lucille, Ms., Co-ordinator, International Services Division, International and Provincial Relations, Department of Labour, (Canada).
CASSON, Peter, Mr., Deputy Director, External Relations and Inter-Agency Affairs, United Nations Office in Geneva, (United Nations).

CASTELLANOS, Diego Luis, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra, (Venezuela).

CASTILLA, C.A., Mr., External Relations Officer, (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade).

CHAMBERS, S.B., Mr., OBE (Jamaica), President, Jamaica Employers' Federation.

CHANDrasekharan, P.H., M., secrétaire exécutif, (Organisation internationale des employeurs).

CHARRY SAmPER, Héctor, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de Colombia en Ginebra, (Colombia).

CHAVEZ GODOY, Luis, Sr., representante permanente alterno del Perú en Ginebra, (Perú).

CHERIF, Habib, M., directeur du travail, ministère des Affaires sociales; représentant du gouvernement de la Tunisie au Conseil d'administration, (Tunisie).

CIZEK, Josef, M., deuxième secrétaire, mission permanente de la République socialiste tchécoslovaque à Genève, (Tchécoslovaquie).

COATES, John Arthur Gordon, Mr., DFC (United Kingdom), Chairman, International Labour Committee, Confederation of British Industry.

CONDE BANDRES, M., Sr. (España), Presidente, Hariana Bandrés y Conde.

CORBIÉ, F., Mr., Director of Labour Administration, Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Co-operatives; representative of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago on the Governing Body, (Trinidad and Tobago).

CORDER-VALLE, Antonio, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de Honduras en Ginebra; representante del Gobierno de Honduras en el Consejo de Administración, (Honduras).

CONDE BANDRES, M., Sr. (España), Presidente, Hariana Bandrés y Conde.


DALL, Stina, Mrs., Swedish Employers' Confederation; accompanying Mr. Bergenström.


DAVENPORT, Bernard, Mr., Deputy Permanent Representative of Ireland in Geneva, (Ireland).

DELABRÉE, Hubert, M., inspecteur général des affaires sociales; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la France au Conseil d'administration, (France).

DIALLO Dramey, Christian, M. (Congo), président de la Chambre de commerce, d'agriculture et d'industrie.

DIKLIC-TRAIKOVIC, Gordana, Mrs., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Yugoslavia in Geneva, (Yugoslavia).

DIRIE, Ismail M., Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Somali Democratic Republic in Geneva, (Somalia).

DOMOKOS, Matyas, S.E., ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la République populaire hongroise à Genève, (Hongrie).

OI  EL BATAWI, M.A., Dr., Chief, Occupational Health, (World Health Organisation).

GACT  EL FAZAA, Abdeljelil, M., secrétaire d'ambassade, mission permanente de Tunisie à Genève, (Tunisie).

GA  ENE, Constantin, S.E., ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la République socialiste de Roumanie à Genève, (Roumanie).

TCT  ENGELEN-KEFER, U., Mrs., Chief of Division, Executive Board, German Confederation of Trade Unions (DBG); accompanying Mr. Muhr.

OI  FAHMY, Mohamed Mahmoud, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission in Geneva, (League of Arab States).

TA  FASSINA, Bruno, M. (Italie), ancien secrétaire national, Fédération des textiles de la Confédération italienne des syndicats de travailleurs (CISL).

ONG  FAUCHERE, Beatrice, Mme, bureau de Genève, (Confédération mondiale du travail).

TA  FILIPAS, C., Mme (Roumanie), secrétaire au Conseil central de l'Union générale des syndicats.

TACT  FLOREA, Gheorghe, M., membre du Conseil central de l'Union générale des syndicats; accompagnant Mme Filipas.

G  FOGARTY, A.D., Mr., Minister (Special Labour Adviser), Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva; representative of the Government of Australia on the Governing Body, (Australia).

ONG  FORTENEAU, Gérard, M., secrétaire général adjoint, (Confédération mondiale du travail).

G  FRANIC, Josip, Mr., Director, Federal Bureau for Employment; representative of the Government of Yugoslavia on the Governing Body, (Yugoslavia).

GS  FREEMAN, Helen, Ms., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva, (Australia).

ONG  FRENETTE, Gilles, M., représentant permanent à Genève, (Confédération mondiale du travail).

GAS  FRONCZAK, Wackaw, Chief Specialist, Mr., Ministry of Labour, Wages and Social Affairs, (Poland).

TACT  GABAGLIO, Emilio, M., département international, Confédération italienne des syndicats de travailleurs; accompagnant M. Fassina.

GMM  GAYNOR, Sean, H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Ireland in Geneva, (Ireland).

OI  GEISER, H., Mr., Officer in charge, (United Nations).

E  GHAYOUR, Massoud, M. (Iran), président, Sociétés Indamine et Seti; membre du Conseil supérieur du travail.

G  GOMES CHIARELLI, Carlos A., Sr., Secretaria do Trabalho do Estado; représentante suppléante del Gobierno del Brasil en el Consejo de Administración, (Brasil).

EA  GONZALEZ BLANCO, D., Sr. (Brasil), Presidente del Consejo de la Organización Internacional de Empleadores.

GAS  GONZALEZ IZQUIERDO, Cristobal, Sr., consejero adscripto, Misión Permanente de Cuba en Ginebra, (Cuba).

G  GONZALEZ MARTINEZ, Aida, Srta., Directora General de Asuntos Internacionales, Secretaria de Trabajo y Previsión Social; representante del Gobierno de México en el Consejo de Administración, (México).

T  GONZALEZ NAVARRO, José, Sr. (Venezuela), Confederación de Trabajadores de Venezuela.
GNA GRAINGER, B.J., Miss, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of New Zealand in Geneva, (New Zealand).


GS GRIFFIN, Héctor, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra; representante suplente del Gobierno de Venezuela en el Consejo de Administración, (Venezuela).

GNN GRUNDBERG, Lars, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Sweden in Geneva, (Sweden).

GCT GUERBOV, V.M., M., conseiller, ministère des Affaires étrangères, (URSS).

GA GUESSOGO NKONO, Thomas, M., directeur du travail, ministère du Travail, (République-Unie du Cameroun).

ONG GUIJARRO-ZUBIZARRETA, Pedro, M., assistant du secrétaire général, (Organisation internationale des employeurs).


EACT HAK, Cornelia, Ms., Chief, International Social Affairs Division, Federation of Netherlands Industry; accompanying Mr. Verschueren.

GS HANDLER, Kurt, Mr., Governmental Counsellor, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, (Federal Republic of Germany).

T HARAUCHI, Y., Mr. (Japan), President, ZENKO (All Japan Metal Miners Union).

GS HASHMI, Akhlag, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission in Geneva, (Pakistan).

T HAWKE, R.J., Mr. (Australia), President, Australian Council of Trade Unions.

ES HEALY, Patrick Augustine, Mr., OBE, Head, International Labour Department, Confederation of British Industry; personal substitute for Mr. Coates.

GNN HECKEL, Rainer, Mr., Ministry of Foreign Affairs, (German Democratic Republic).

ECT HEINZEMANN, B., Mr., Confederation of German Employers’ Associations; accompanying Mr. Lindner.

G HELDAL, Halldor, Mr., Deputy Director, Ministry of Social Affairs; representative of the Government of Norway on the Governing Body, (Norway).

GS HESS, C.M.J., Mr., Assistant Secretary, Department of Employment, (United Kingdom).

TCT HEYER, Albert, Mr.; accompanying Mr. Muhr.

G MODJIKINS, D.J., Mr., Under-Secretary, Department of Employment; representative of the Government of the United Kingdom on the Governing Body, (United Kingdom).

TCT HUMPHRIES, Colin, Mr., Trades Union Congress; accompanying Mr. Lloyd.

OI HURTADO DE MENDOZA, Félix, Mr., Counsellor, European Regional Office, (Organization of American States).

GS HUSSEIN, Abdullah Ghouloum, Mr., Head, External Affairs Service, Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour, (Kuwait).

GACT IBRAHIM, Izhar, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva, (Indonesia).

ONG IBRAHIM, M., M., secrétaire de la FSM, (Fédération syndicale mondiale).
IDOUX, M., Mr., Interregional Adviser on Training, UNDP European Office, (United Nations).

INAL, Mehmet Ali, Mr., Counsellor of Labour, Permanent Mission of Turkey in Geneva, (Turkey).

ISAACSSON, Bert, Mr., Director of International Affairs, Ministry of Labour, (Sweden).

ISHIKAWA, Mitsukazu, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body, (Japan).

IWATA, Teruyoshi, Mr., Deputy Vice-Minister for International Labour Affairs, Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body, (Japan).

JAMES, A.W.D., Mr., Department of Employment, (United Kingdom).

JENNINGS, J., Mr., Manufactures Division, (United Nations).

JIMENEZ DAVILA, Fernando, Sr., Ministro Plenipotenciario, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra, (Argentina).

DE JONG, I., Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Netherlands in Geneva, (Netherlands).

KAISER, Ernest, M., trésorier, (Association internationale de la sécurité sociale).

KAMARA, Formeh, The Hon., Minister of Labour, (Sierra Leone).


KARY, Abdol Hossein Mohassad, M., directeur général des relations internationales, ministère du Travail et des Affaires sociales; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de l'Iran au Conseil d'administration, (Iran).


KIKONGI di MWINSA, M. (Zaire).

KOCSIS, V., M., conseiller, ministère des Affaires étrangères, (Hongrie).


KULPINSKI, Jan, Mr., ministre plénipotentiaire; représentant du gouvernement de la République populaire de Pologne au Conseil d'administration, (Poland).

LABRUNE, L., M., représentant permanent à Genève, (Fédération syndicale mondiale).

LAGASSE, R., M., secrétaire général, (Organisation internationale des employeurs).

LAGOS, Jaime, Sr., consejero, Misión Permanente de Chile en Ginebra, (Chile).

LAURBERG, Hans Chr., Mr., Head of Section, International Relations Division, Ministry of Labour, (Denmark).

LECHUGA HEVIA, Carlos, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de Cuba en Ginebra, (Cuba).

LEE, G.Y.L., Mr. (Malaysia), Member of Council, Malayan Mining Employers' Association.

LILLIENHOLM, Björn, Mr., Swedish Employers' Confederation; personal substitute for Mr. Bergenström.

LINDNER, Wolf-Dieter, Mr. (Federal Republic of Germany), Chief, International Social Policy Branch, Confederation of German Employers' Associations.
GCT LISBOA de NECEF, Rosa, Sra., tercer secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra, (Venezuela).

OI LISSITSKY, V., Mr., Co-ordination Officer, External Relations and Inter-Agency Affairs, Office of the Director-General, United Nations Office in Geneva, (United Nations).

T LLOYD, Glyn, Mr. (United Kingdom), Member, General Council of the Trades Union Congress; Member, National Executive of the Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians.

GS LOMBERA PALLARES, Enrique, Sr., consejero de la Misión Permanente de México en Ginebra; representante suplente del Gobierno de México en el Consejo de Administración, (México).


GNM LUKIANOVITCH, V., Mr., Permanent Representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in Geneva, (Byelorussia).

GCT LUNDY, A.C., Ms., United Nations Institutional and Social Affairs Division, Department of External Affairs, (Canada).

GCT MacINNES, K.G., Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva, (United Kingdom).

GACT MACAULEY, J.S., Mr., Labour Officer, Ministry of Labour, (Sierra Leone).

TA MAIER, H., Mr. (Austria), Social Policy Counsellor, Austrian Confederation of Trade Unions.

G MAINWARING, John, Mr., Director-General, International and Provincial Relations, Department of Labour; representative of the Government of Canada on the Governing Body, (Canada).

T MAKLHOUF, Mustapha, M. (Tunisie), secrétaire général adjoint, Union générale tunisienne du travail.


GS MALIKOV, A.S., M., chef de section, ministère des Affaires étrangères, (URSS).

GCT MARANGE, James, M., chargé de mission au cabinet du Président du Conseil économique et social, (France).

GNM MARIA ALEIXO, José, M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente du Portugal à Genève, (Portugal).

GNM MARQUEGNIES, R., Mlle, directeur d'administration, chef, Service des relations internationales, ministère de l'Emploi et du Travail, (Belgique).

E MARTINEZ ESPINO O., F., Sr. (Venezuela), Secretario consultor, Cámara de Comercio de Caracas y Asociación Bancaria Nacional.

GS MARTON, Tamás, M., chef de département, ministère du Travail, (Hongrie).

OI MASSON, Francis D., Mr., Liaison Officer in Geneva, (Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organisation).


T MEHTA, Kanti, Mr. (India), Vice-President, Indian National Trade Union Congress.


GCT MENDÉZ ARCEO, María del Carmen, Sra., Analista, Dirección General de Asuntos Internacionales, Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social, (México).
TA MENDOZA, D.T., Mr. (Philippines), President, Philippines Congress of Trade Unions (PHILCONTU).

G MM MEGONI, Flavio, M., secrétaire d'ambassade, Mission permanente de Suisse à Genève, (Suisse).

GA METAXAS, A., S.E., ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la Grèce en Suisse; représentant du gouvernement de la Grèce au Conseil d'administration, (Grèce).

TCT MITTYAEV, Ivan I., M., chef de service, section internationale, Conseil central de la Confédération des syndicats de l'URSS; accompagnant M. Pimenov.

OI MOCOCAIN, J., Mr., (United Nations).

EA MONITT BALMACEDA, M., Sr. (Chile), Presidente de la Comision de Asuntos Internacionales del Trabajo, Confederación de la Producción y del Comercio.

GAS MORALES, Agustín, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra, (Colombia).

OI MORARU, Ion, Mr., Member, Assistance Division, (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

T MORRIS, J., Mr. (Canada), President, Canadian Labour Congress; Chairman of the Governing Body.

EA MOUKOKO KINGUE, F., M. (Cameroun), Président de l'Union des syndicats professionnels du Cameroun.

T MUHR, Gerd, Mr. (Federal Republic of Germany), Vice-President, German Confederation of Trade Unions (DGB).

GNN MULLER, Horst, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the German Democratic Republic in Geneva, (German Democratic Republic).

GCT MULONGANDUSU, Esule, M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente du Zaire à Genève, (Zaire).

GS NAIR, C.R., Mr., Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Labour, (India).

GNN NALDO, José, Mr., Labor Attache, Permanent Mission of the Philippines in Geneva, (Philippines).

ONG NARITA, Osamu, M, (Organisation internationale des employeurs).

GACT NASIER, Abdul, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva, (Indonesia).

E NASR, M., Mr. (Lebanon), Association of Lebanese Industrialists.

GA NDABAHAGAMÏE, L., M., directeur général du travail et de la sécurité sociale, ministère du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale, (Burundi).

GCT NEMO, André, M., conseiller d'ambassade, Mission permanente de la France à Genève, (France).

GNN NOACK, Ingelt, Mr., Deputy State Secretary for Labour and Wages, (German Democratic Republic).

GCT NOCITO, Alfio, M, (Italie).

GNN NOTERDAEME, P., S.E., Ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la Belgique à Genève, (Belgique).

OI NOUR, Mahmoud Saleh, M., chef, Délégation permanente de l'OAT à Genève, (Organisation arabe du travail).

T ODEYEMI, E.O.A., Mr. (Nigeria).

GNN ÖDMAN, K., Ms., First Secretary, Ministry of Labour, (Sweden).

OLA, James Akinwale, Mr. (Nigeria), President, Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association.

OLOYOY, Khumbagyn, Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of the Mongolian People's Republic in Geneva, (Mongolia).

OPELZ, Merle, Mrs., Head, IAEA Office in Geneva, (International Atomic Energy Agency).

OSMAN, Abdillahi, H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of the Somali Democratic Republic in Geneva, (Somalia).

OTHMAN, Mohamed B., Mr, (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).


PATMARAJAH, A., Mr., Special Representative of the Executive Director in Geneva, (United Nations).

PAXINOS, Pantazis, M., directeur, ministère du Travail, (Grèce).


PINI, Mario Filippo, M., deuxième secrétaire, Mission permanente de l'Italie à Genève, (Italie).

POLESE, P., M. (Italie), membre de la Confédération générale de l'industrie italienne.

POLITES, G., Mr. (Australia), Director, Confederation of Australian Industry, National Employers' Industrial Council.

PRIANO, Daniel A., Sr., Director General de Asuntos Jurídicos, Ministerio del Trabajo, (Argentina).

PURPURA, Rosario, M., ancien directeur général, ministère du Travail et de la Prévoyance sociale; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de l'Italie au Conseil d'administration, (Italie).

QUIJANO-CABALLERO, S. Mr., Director, External Relations and Inter-Agency Affairs, Office of the Director-General, United Nations Office in Geneva, (United Nations).
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