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MINUTES OF THE 212TH SESSION

The 212th Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva from Tuesday, 4 March to Friday, 7 March 1980.

The Governing Body was composed as follows:

Chairman: Mr. DONTSOP (United Republic of Cameroon)

Government group:

- Bangladesh: Majumdar
- Brazil: Maciel
- United Republic of Cameroon: Misse
- Canada: Mainswaran
- Colombia: Jaminillo
- Czechoslovakia: Kysely
- France: Ventejol
- Germany, Federal Republic of: Haase
- Guyana: Sempel
- Honduras: Pineda Conteras
- India: Ragupathi
- Iran: Emami
- Italy: Falchi
- Ivory Coast: Essy
- Japan: Suzuki
- Lebanon: Khoury
- Niger: Naya
- Peru: Miss Silva y Silva
- Romania: Tudor
- Sierra Leone: Kebrie
- Spain: Jimenez de Parga
- Thailand: Sangtong
- Tunisia: Maarouri
- USSR: Kostine
- United Kingdom: Hodgkins
- Venezuela: Martini Urdaneta
- Zambia: Lukutati

Approved by the Governing Body at the first sitting of its 213th Session, held on 29 May 1980.
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- **Sweden:** Mr. ISACSSON
- **Switzerland:** Mr. BONNY
- **Uruguay:** Mr. FALCHIETTI MIGNONE
- **Yugoslavia:** Mr. TOMASEVIC

**Employers' group:**
- Mr. ARBESSER-RASTBURG
- Mr. ASPOUR
- Mr. BANNERMAN-MENSON
- Mr. CASTELLANO SABATER
- Mr. CHAMBERS
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The following were also present:

Mr. BLANCHARD, Director-General  
Mr. BOLIN, Deputy Director-General  
Mr. JAIN, Deputy Director-General  
Mr. WOLF, Assistant Director-General; Legal Adviser  
Mr. ASTAPENKO, Assistant Director-General  
Dr. BURGAN, Assistant Director-General  
Mr. DENBY, Assistant Director-General; Treasurer and Financial Comptroller  
Mr. VALTICOS, Assistant Director-General; Adviser for International Labour Standards  
Mr. YOSHIMURA, Assistant Director-General  
Mr. GALEE, Assistant Director-General  
Mr. KANE, Assistant Director-General  
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United Nations:
- Mr. QUIJANO-CABALLERO
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- Mr. PATHMARAJAH
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International Confederation of Free Trade Unions:
- Mr. VANDERVEKEN

International Organisation of Employers:
- Mr. LAGISSE

International Social Security Association:
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World Confederation of Labour:
- Mr. VAN TANH

World Federation of Trade Unions:
- Mr. de ANGELI

Substitutes and advisers:

Mr. ABOU ASSY, substitute for Mr. KHOURY
Mr. AJAI, substitute for Mr. OMOYEL
Mr. AKOPOV, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. ALBALATE LAFITA, substitute for Mr. JIMENEZ de PARGA
Mr. ALDEA, substitute for Mr. TUDOR
Mr. d'ANDREA, accompanying Mr. PALCHETTI MIGONE
Mr. BARENO, accompanying Mr. JARAMILLO
Mr. BATES, accompanying Mr. HODGKINS
Mr. BEL HADJ HASSINE, substitute for Mr. MAAMOUI
Mrs. BEN AMOR, accompanying Mr. MAAMOUI
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Mr. van BLANKENSTEIN, accompanying Mr. SOHNS
Mr. BLAUBROCK, accompanying Mr. HAASE
Mr. de BOCK, accompanying Miss MARQUEIGNIES
Mr. BOGHAR, accompanying Mr. TIMMER
Mrs. BONNY, accompanying Mr. LAGASSE
Mr. BORDADINE, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. BORG, substitute for Mr. DEBONO
Mr. BRUGERE, accompanying Mr. VENTEJOL
Mr. CARRERA, accompanying Mr. PALCHETTI MIGNONE
Mr. CANO de SANTANA y BATRES, substitute for Mr. JIMENEZ de PARGA
Mrs. CARON, substitute for Mr. MAINWARING
Mr. CARTIER, accompanying Mr. VENTEJOL
Mr. CENTOLA, substitute for Mr. MARTINEZ
Mr. CHANDRASEKHARAN, accompanying Mr. LAGASSE
Mrs. CHIOLA de PIRIX PACHECO, accompanying Mr. PALCHETTI MIGNONE
Mr. CHRISTENSEN, accompanying Mr. ANDERSEN
Mr. CONDOMINES PERERA, substitute for Mr. JIMENEZ de PARGA
Mr. CORDILL, substitute for Mr. ISACSSON
Mr. DACHKEVITCH, accompanying Mr. BATIUK
Mrs. DALL, accompanying Mr. von HOLTE
Mr. DAMEN, accompanying Mr. VAN TANH
Mr. DAS, substitute for Mr. RAGHUPATHU
Mr. DAVYDOV, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. DEGABRIELE, substitute for Mr. DEBONO
Mr. DELARBE, substitute for Mr. VENTEJOL
Mr. DESAI, accompanying Mr. PETITPIERRE
Miss DIEGO DE ARMAS, substitute for Miss GONZALEZ MARTINEZ
Mr. DJEMALI, accompanying Mr. KEIDAIR
Ms. DJEMAKOYE, accompanying Mr. QUIJANO-CABALLERO
Mr. DUFOUR, accompanying Mr. PEEL
Mr. EL-FAZAA, accompanying Mr. MAANOURI
Mrs. ENGELEN-KEFEE, accompanying Mr. MUHR
Mrs. FABREGES, accompanying Mr. VAN TANH
Miss PEHERO, accompanying Mr. MARTINI URBANETA
Mr. FODA, accompanying Mr. EL-SHAFIE
Mr. FOMITCHEV, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Ms. FREDRIKSSON, substitute for Mr. ISACSSON
Ms. FREEMAN, accompanying Mr. FOGARTY
Miss FUJISAWA, accompanying Mr. TANAKA
Mr. GARCIA, substitute for Mr. HODGKINS
Ms. GARCIA TEJJEDOR, substitute for Mr. JIMENEZ de PARGA
Mr. GAUDREAU, accompanying Mr. MAINWARING
Mr. GIGURE, accompanying Mr. MAINWARING
Ms. GRAY, accompanying Mr. LLOYD
Mr. GRUBER, accompanying Mr. NOACK
Mr. GUBERA, accompanying Mr. JARAMILLO
Ms. GUIODOBO, substitute for Mr. MARTINEZ
Mr. HAGEN, accompanying Mr. SOHNS
Mr. HANDLE, substitute for Mr. HAASE
Miss HAMLISCH, accompanying Mr. KOISSER
Mr. HAYASHIDA, accompanying Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. HEALY, substitute for Mr. COATES
Mr. HECKEL, accompanying Mr. NOACK
Mr. HEGOY TERRA, substitute for Mr. PALCHETTI MIGNONE
Mr. HEINZEMANN, accompanying Mr. LINDNER
Mr. HEYER, accompanying Mr. MUHR
Mrs. HILLI, accompanying Mr. AL-TAGHLABI
Mr. HURTADO de MENDOZA, accompanying Mr. GODOY ARCAIA
Mr. de ICALA, substitute for Miss GONZALEZ MARTINEZ
Mr. IDOZI, accompanying Mr. PETITPIERRE
Mr. TINGGI, substitute for Mr. LUKUTARI
Mr. INCISA di CAMERANA, accompanying Mr. PALCHI
Ms. IONESCU, substitute for Mr. TUDOR
Mr. ISHIKAWA, substitute for Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. JERKIC, substitute for Mr. TOMASEVIC
Mr. JIMENEZ DAVILA, substitute for Mr. MARTINEZ
Mr. JOHNSTON, accompanying Mr. KEBBIE
Mr. de JONG, accompanying Mr. SOHNS
Mr. JUNGE, accompanying Mr. NOACK
Mr. KANEKO, accompanying Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. KARES, substitute for Mr. KYSELY
Mr. KHALIFA, accompanying Mr. EL-SHAFEI
Mr. KHAN, accompanying Mr. QUIJANO-CABALLERO
Mr. KONANTE-FRONCE, substitute for Mr. ESSY
Mrs. KROGER-MOOSMANN, substitute for Mr. HAASE
Mr. LABRUNE, accompanying Mr. de ANGELI
Miss LAPYERERE, accompanying Mr. LOAZA-MARIACA
Mr. LIDAL, accompanying Mr. ISACSSON
Mr. LINSENMAIER, accompanying Mr. QUACKENBUSH
Mr. LOHRMANN, accompanying Mr. BUENO do PRADO
Mr. LUNA CORONA, accompanying Miss GONZALEZ MARTINEZ
Ms. LUNDBERG, substitute for Mr. ISACSSON
Mr. MACAULEY, substitute for Mr. KEBBIE
Mr. MACINNES, accompanying Mr. HODGKINS
Mr. MAJID, substitute for Mr. SEMPLE
Mr. MALIKOV, substitute for Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. MALINTOPPI, substitute for Mr. FALCHI
Mr. MANOR, accompanying Mr. BARBONI
Mr. MARZBANIAN, accompanying Mr. EMAMI
Mr. MATA SALAS, accompanying Mr. SOLA VILA
Mr. MCCONNAGH, accompanying Mr. GAYNOR
Mr. MEROZI, accompanying Mr. BONNY
Mr. MITTAYEV, accompanying Mr. DIMEZ
Mrs. MUJICA de ADAMES, accompanying Mr. MARTINI URDANETA
Mr. MUNT, substitute for Mr. KHAN
Mr. MURPHY, accompanying Mr. QUIJANO-CABALLERO
Mr. NAIR, substitute for Mr. RAGHUPATHI
Mr. NAKAMOTO, accompanying Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. NAKATANI, substitute for Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. NALDO, substitute for Mr. BRILLANTES
Mr. NARASE, accompanying Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. NERPELOV, accompanying Mr. KOSTINE
Mr. NIBO, accompanying Mr. VENTEJOOL
Mr. NUCETE-BONDON, accompanying Mr. MARTINI URDANETA
Mr. ODEA-OTENG, accompanying Mr. MUSIKO
Mr. OLYA, accompanying Mr. FALCHI
Mr. OMKELINX, accompanying Miss MARQUEGNIES
Mr. PADOLECCII, accompanying Mr. PATHMARAJAH
Mr. PENALOSA, accompanying Mr. LAGASSE
Mr. PEREZ CASTILLO, substitute for Mr. MARTINI URDANETA
Mr. PINTO, accompanying Mr. KARKAINEN
Mr. PANTHARGOON, substitute for Mr. SANGTONG
Mr. PERNERBTON, accompanying Mr. QUACKENBUSH
Mr. RIKONEN, accompanying Mr. KARKAINEN
Mr. ROBEL, accompanying Mr. VAN TANH
Miss ROCHE, substitute for Mr. OECHSLIN
Mr. RIS, accompanying Mr. WOLFF
Mr. SADIRU, accompanying Mr. LANGHAMMER
Mr. SITO, substitute for Mr. SUZUKI
Mr. SIMBINE, substitute for Mr. JOCHUA
Mrs. SLAMOVA, accompanying Mr. KYSELY
Mr. SMIT, accompanying Mr. SÖHNS
Mr. STEPHENS, accompanying Mr. QUACKENBUSH
Mr. SUSSEX, accompanying Mr. VANDERVEKEN
Mr. SUZUKI, accompanying Mr. YOSHINO
Miss UBLFIECHT, accompanying Mr. LAGASSE
Mr. UTHEIN, accompanying Mr. BRUAAS
Mr. VERGNE SOBOZA, substitute for Mr. MACIEL
Mr. de WEISS-REILINGH, accompanying Mr. VANDERVEKEN
Miss WEBSTER, accompanying Mrs. OPELZ
Mr. WILLIAMS, accompanying Mr. OMOYELA
Mr. WIRTH, accompanying Mr. HAASE
Mr. WOOLGAR, accompanying Mr. HODGKINS
Mr. ZENGEL, substitute for Mr. BONNY
Mr. ZENKER, substitute for Mr. NOACK
Mr. ZOGHANOS, accompanying Mr. QUIJANO-CABALLERO
The sitting opened at 10.15 a.m., under the chairmanship of Mr. Pontsoo.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

The Chairman welcomed those present, particularly those attending a Governing Body session for the first time. He thanked Mr. Hainwaring for having acted as Chairman of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee in his unavoidable absence.

He went on to address a cordial welcome to the United States of America, which after two years of absence had rejoined the Organisation on 18 February 1980. The ILO was perhaps not quite the same as when the United States had left it, but in the meantime it had carried on with composure a task whose aims and principles were very much in accord with the staunch democratic traditions of the American people and their abiding faith in progress.

He thanked the Director-General and his associates for their resourcefulness in maintaining the credibility of the Organisation during a difficult period and their valuable contribution towards restoring normal relations between the United States and the ILO. That process, which had taken place under his chairmanship, constituted legitimate grounds for satisfaction both for himself and for the Employer and Worker Vice-Chairmen of the Governing Body.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) had seldom felt such satisfaction as she now did in extending, on behalf of the Government group, congratulations to the International Labour Organisation, the Office, the Governing Body as a whole and the government of a great and friendly nation on its return to a body to which it naturally and rightfully belonged.

The decision of the United States Government, formally notified to the Director-General on 16 February 1980, would be welcomed by all Members of the ILO without exception.

The sovereign decision taken by the United States Government in 1977 - which was respected but regretted by all - had tested the strength, solidity and capacity for work of the Organisation. Its universality, already weakened somewhat at the time, had sustained a heavy blow, for an Organisation devoted to the achievement of full employment, higher living standards for all workers in the world and respect for their labour and social rights could hardly succeed in its task without the tripartite participation of a country having contributed so much in terms of social policy to the Organisation.

The absence of the United States for two years had given the ILO an opportunity to demonstrate - as it had done during the Second World War and on other occasions - that the principles and purposes of 1919, enshrined in the Preamble to the Constitution and the Declaration of Philadelphia, were every bit as valid as they had ever been: unshakable despite fluctuations in membership, and an enduring source of inspiration in every situation, however critical.

The universality of the Organisation had been greatly strengthened by the return of the United States, to which the Government group extended a cordial welcome, but it was still not complete. It was to be hoped that the skill that the Director-General had shown in the present situation would go on producing good results in the future.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) associated himself with the remarks of the previous two speakers. The ILO could hardly discharge its mission of promoting world social progress without the United States, whose absence had been, from the Organisation's point of view, much more than a purely financial problem.

Special congratulations were due to the Director-General for, although many deserved their fair share of the credit, the return of the United States was mainly
his work and was due to his tenacity and uniring efforts to convince the Americans that their rightful place was in the ILO.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman), speaking for his group, joined the previous speakers in welcoming the United States back to the ILO. Through its return the United States had signified its acceptance of its obligations not only to the ILO but to the world community.

The Organisation had gone through a trying time, but it was now seeing the light at the end of the tunnel and it had been restored to its former universality. It was to be hoped that in the conduct of the ILO's future affairs care would be taken to avoid creating the kind of problems within the Organisation that had led to the temporary withdrawal of the United States. Now that the matter had been happily resolved, the Organisation should concentrate its energies on the activities for which it was created.

FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Approval of the Minutes of the 211th Session

Subject to the corrections received, the Governing Body approved the minutes of its 211th Session.

TWENTY-FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Determination of the Members of the Organisation of Chief Industrial Importance

Mr. Jimenez de Parga (Government, Spain) recalled that at the 208th Session (November 1978), when the replacement of the United States as a Member of chief industrial importance was under discussion, he had entered reservations as to the manner in which the experts had advised the Officers, and through them the Governing Body, on the classification of the countries of chief industrial importance. Since, in view of the foreseeably early return of the United States, the subject appeared to be of transitory importance, so that the decision would be of limited effect, and since the country - the Officers had advised - on the basis of the Committee's recommendations was a member of the Hispanic community, he had let the subject pass without resorting to the procedural possibilities offered by the Constitution and other statutory texts, under which final appeal lay to the International Court of Justice in The Hague.

The position now was different, as the complete list had to be drawn up afresh, and the Spanish Government was firmly determined, in case there was on this occasion any departure from the Constitution and the rules, to take the matter all the way to the International Court of Justice.

The quasi-secret report of the last committee of experts, based on confidential figures, did not list the ten countries of chief "industrial" importance but, by the experts' own admission, those of chief "economic" importance. The experts were entitled to their opinions in this, but that did not mean that they were free, as statisticians, to depart from the letter of the Constitution, which laid down clear and unequivocal rules.

Accordingly, the Spanish Government's position was, first, that paragraph 5 of the Officers' report should be adopted, inviting the Director-General to submit nominations, but, secondly, that the committee of statistical experts set up in accordance with the Constitution and the Standing Orders of the Governing Body should determine the ten countries of chief "industrial" importance and not of chief "economic" importance in violation of the letter and spirit of the Constitution, nor select criteria to that end; thirdly, the committee of statistical experts should make a complete review of the list of Members of chief industrial importance, in compliance with article 13 of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body; and,
fourthly, the committee of experts should submit a complete report with figures, and all the necessary data should be given so as to establish beyond doubt which were the ten countries of chief industrial importance.

As to the choice of experts, the Spanish Government considered it important that, while the experts should of course be as impartial as possible, they should also represent all regions of the world.

Mr. Saboia (Government, Brazil) thanked the previous speaker for the forbearance he had shown towards Brazil, but did not think the designation of Brazil in November 1978 was a matter of forbearance; it stemmed rather from the opinion of a group of impartial experts who had reported that, by a permutation of five different methods of calculation, Brazil was shown in each case to be one of the ten ILO members of chief industrial importance.

As to whether or not the criterion of chief "economic" importance was admissible, it seemed that the Constitution and Standing Orders gave sufficient leeway to the experts to decide, as they had done for years, that the words in the Constitution meant "countries of general economic importance". It was therefore not appropriate to lay down rules for the committee of experts, but rather to accept that the experts should decide what criteria to use, as they had done in the past.

Mr. Tudor (Government, Romania) observed a certain contrast in the procedure applied in the various bodies of the Organisation. While the Officers had acted with commendable speed in submitting the proposals now before the Governing Body, the work of the Working Party on Structure was dragging on interminably. Among the questions before the Working Party was that of the non-elective seats on the Governing Body, and recommendations for the elimination of that far from democratic institution had been long awaited. It was high time for the Working Party to make real headway and put forward concrete proposals on all the subjects under review.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) acknowledged that the question of the ten seats reserved for the countries of chief industrial importance was indeed under consideration in the Working Party on Structure, where a formula for doing away with those seats seemed on the point of being worked out. The Employers had no objection to that and felt that a speedy solution might be found.

For the time being, however, the only course was to apply the rules of the Constitution and the Standing Orders as they stood; that was the purpose of the recommendation before the Governing Body, which was aimed merely at applying article 13 of the Governing Body's Standing Orders. Substantive discussion was not called for at this stage, but would take place only after the committee of experts had reported, in accordance with Article 7 of the Constitution.

Mr. Jaramillo (Government, Colombia) confirmed his Government's view that the ten non-elective members of the Governing Body should be chosen in strict conformity with the rules of the ILO Constitution and that there was no room for any interpretation on the subject.

He congratulated the United States on its return to the Organisation and hoped that this would contribute appreciably to an early solution of all the problems of structure now before the ILO.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 3 and 5 of the Officers' report.

The Director-General said that, pursuant to that decision, he would submit proposals for the committee of experts as quickly as possible.¹

¹ See below, eighth sitting.
Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed the Employers' disappointment with the rather bald account of the Third European Regional Conference contained in the Office paper, which was largely confined to a few trite paragraphs on uncontroversial matters and left anyone who had not attended the Conference little the wiser. In particular, it glossed over the quite sharp disagreement prompted by some of the topics covered in the Director-General's Report, such as employment and hours of work. Although the debate had not always matched the excellent quality of that report, it had provided some interesting ideas which would have been well worth drawing to the Governing Body's attention.

In the Employers' view Office papers on regional conferences should give a much fuller picture of the proceedings. Even though members of Governing Body delegations reported back to their groups - and their impressions were extremely valuable - it would still be helpful for Office papers to be more informative. In the present instance the debate had not been nearly so bland and academic as the Office paper suggested; on the contrary, there had been a clear determination to come to grips with Europe's social problems. Such problems were the stuff debate was made of, and nothing was to be gained from implying that there had been unanimity about them. That European countries were worried about inflation and unemployment was hardly news; it would have been more enlightening to place before the Governing Body the reports of the two Conference committees, where the real discussion had taken place. The main purpose of regional meetings, which was to provide guidance for tackling regional problems, was hardly served by producing such colourless papers as the one now before the Governing Body.

The Conference's resolutions on questions not included in its agenda, like those adopted at the General Conference, touched on many controversial matters. For example, Part III of the resolution concerning the contribution of the ILO to the development of co-operation in Europe related to disarmament. That subject, which many thought was none of the ILO's concern, was brought up time after time by the very country which spent more of its gross national product on armaments than any other major power. Arms expenditure was indeed appallingly high, and it did nothing to foster economic or social progress. No one would quarrel with a country's seeking to protect itself, but sometimes the purpose was not self-defence, but aggression. There was a striking contrast between the call for disarmament in the resolution - which European countries had unanimously adopted only last October - and certain subsequent events. As everyone knew, one of the largest countries of Europe had launched a military intervention in a non-European country, and it had been roundly condemned, for example in a resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 15 January 1980.

The resolution concerning freedom of association, trade union rights and industrial relations in Europe was a welcome affirmation of cardinal principles. Its preamble cited the resolution which the General Conference had adopted on the subject at its 54th Session and which declared that there could be no real freedom of association without full respect for basic civil liberties, such as freedom of speech. At a meeting held recently in Hamburg in connection with the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, Professor André Lwoff, an eminent French biologist and winner of the Nobel Prize in 1965, had expressed a similar view. Freedom, he had said, meant that the citizen was allowed to travel abroad, to criticise authority without fear of dismissal, prosecution, imprisonment, torture or other forms of persecution and to call for full application of the Helsinki agreements without risking the loss of civil liberties or a sentence of forced labour. Unrestricted freedom of association was a rare commodity at the best of times: it had to be fought for every inch of the way, and the battle was never really won; but there could not be even a glimmer of such freedom unless the basic freedom to dissent from authority was safeguarded. Seen in that light, the treatment meted out to dissidents in the largest country of Europe was all the more disturbing. On 25 October 1979, the very day on which the European Conference had closed, citizens of a neighbouring country who had done no more than express their opinions had suffered disproportionately severe punishment, and it seemed that more and more frequent use was being made of administrative and even pseudo-medical procedures to quell dissent. One man stood out as a symbol of such persecution: Dr. Andrei Sakharov.
It was pointless for the ILO to hold meetings in Europe if they did nothing but indulge in a hypocritical exchange of courtesies. What any ILO meeting worthy of the name must do was to tackle real problems and suggest real solutions. That was why the Employers wholeheartedly endorsed the requests addressed to the Governing Body in operative paragraph 5 of the resolution on freedom of association, particularly the one in subparagraph (e) for carrying out studies of the trade union situation and industrial relations in European countries. They also favoured the idea, put forward in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, of having tripartite missions carry out such studies.

Lastly, in its resolution on the ILO's contribution to co-operation in Europe the Conference suggested convening a Fourth European Regional Conference "at an appropriate time". The Employers thought the present time inappropriate for scheduling such a Conference: before that possibility was considered there should be evidence of a real determination to deal in depth with Europe's problems and tackle them in their full complexity.

Mr. Vehr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking for the Workers, said that while on this occasion formal expressions of thanks to a host government were not called for - since the Conference had been held at the ILO's own headquarters - the Office should be warmly commended on the excellent arrangements made for the meeting and its unfailing support to participants. The Conference had been a success, and the Workers were glad to see that the Director-General had taken account of many of its suggestions in drafting the Medium-Term Plan for 1982-87.

One problem had been to determine the procedure for considering resolutions on questions not included in the agenda. Unfortunately there were no clear-cut rules at regional conferences comparable to those for determining the order of consideration of resolutions at the General Conference, and the Resolutions Committee had spent much more time debating points of procedure than studying the text of the draft resolutions. Although in the end it had managed to get through, its task had not been easy, and the Workers suggested that the Governing Body's Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations might consider drafting a resolutions procedure for regional conferences along the lines of that applied at the General Conference.

For years there had been controversy about the need for European regional conferences, and perhaps it was not settled even yet. But the Workers believed that in a region faced with so many problems that need was beyond dispute. Anyone who had attended the Conference last year could vouch for its determination to come to grips with those problems, and indeed it was borne out by the record of proceedings, which showed what a wide range of subjects had been tackled. Mr. Yllanes Ramos, the Employer member of the Governing Body delegation, had in his closing speech expressed his conviction that the Conference had dissipated any possible doubt about the need for such gatherings.

Although the Office paper followed the normal pattern, the Workers tended to agree with the Employers' criticisms: it would be helpful if in future the Office submitted fuller papers and gave some account of the work done in the committees.

Though naturally preoccupied with regional problems, the Conference had not forgotten Europe's responsibilities towards the developing countries. Europe had doubtless known speedy economic growth, but the Conference had realised that further progress would mean enabling other regions to catch up and that indeed Europe had a moral obligation to help countries which, with little or no benefit to themselves, had enabled it to achieve such an advanced stage of development. But current structural and technical change made its effects on employment and in other areas felt in advanced as much as in developing countries. Europe, too, knew poverty and unemployment, and it was in everyone's interest to see them eliminated: Europe would then be better able to fulfil its responsibilities towards the developing world.

The Workers warmly welcomed the resolution concerning young people and work, and commended it to the attention of Governing Body members from other regions. The Conference had stressed the importance of sound training and employment policy for young people. It had stressed, too, the fact that it was not enough to provide young people with jobs and training adapted to the constant changes in economic conditions and the employment market: they must also be given opportunities for self-fulfilment, an essential condition of their participation in the cultural and social life of the community.
In its resolution on the other agenda items, the improvement of working conditions and the working environment, the Conference had called for further efforts to raise safety and health standards and improve the organisation and conditions of work. That, in the Workers' view, was a social objective of crucial concern to all European countries, whatever their economic and social system, and it had been gratifying to see the Conference give it such serious attention. The primary responsibility lay with the enterprise but, as was stated in paragraph 7 of the resolution, education in safety and health should start at school, form part of vocational training and continue throughout working life.

The resolution also contained a timely warning against the dangers of new work processes and new products, hundreds of which were developed every year. Sometimes the hazard was not discovered until too late, and that was why paragraph 33(f) called for more rapid development of the ILO's International Occupational Safety and Health Hazard Alert System. Also timely was the recommendation in paragraph 35 for close co-operation with other European organisations so as to prevent duplication of work in the field of safety and health.

The Workers especially welcomed the section of the resolution on working time. Shorter working hours were, in their view, a factor not only of social progress but also of full employment in Europe.

Of the other resolutions, the one on the employment consequences of the introduction of new technologies was especially worth mentioning. As the Conference had recognised, the increasing use of micro-electronic systems would fundamentally change methods and conditions of work in Europe in the years ahead. The introduction of such systems was doubtless a form of rationalisation, as the Conference had recognised, but what the Workers feared was that it might eliminate more jobs than it created and make many skills obsolete.

The Workers wholeheartedly supported the resolution on freedom of association, trade union rights and industrial relations - a matter of paramount concern to the ILO. As was stressed in the preamble, trade union rights would not be secure without full respect for certain other rights and civil liberties - freedom from arbitrary arrest, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, the right to a fair trial by an independent and impartial judiciary and the right to protection of trade union property. The Workers' group at the Conference had been adamant on that score. Another point of topical concern in Europe, duly reflected in the preamble, was that trade union rights should apply to the public as well as to the private sector.

In its resolution concerning the problems of intra-European migration the Conference had done well to highlight the problems of migrant workers' families. In countries with many immigrant workers it was vital to help their children to fit into the alien culture and, among other things, make it possible for them to decide freely whether to stay abroad or return home.

Lastly, the Workers commended to the Governing Body the proposal in paragraph 3(a) of the resolution concerning the ILO's contribution to co-operation in Europe for establishing a European Advisory Committee. The gravity of the problems which the Conference had discussed bore out the need for such a committee to keep abreast of developments and prepare for the next regional conference. The Workers believed that such conferences should be as frequent for Europe as for other regions, and they looked forward to discussing plans for the next European conference in due course.

Mr. Yllanes Ramos (Employer, Mexico), who had attended the Conference as the Employer member of the Governing Body delegation, felt that it had been much more useful than the first two European conferences, which he had attended in the same capacity. The debate had been of a high standard, lively and stimulating, and that in turn had been largely due to the quality of the Director-General's Report.

Unfortunately, the Office paper did less than full justice to what had actually happened at the Conference. To that extent it was not objective and ran counter to the main purpose of holding regional conferences, namely keeping the ILO and its membership abreast of regional problems and trends.

In the early days most of the ILO's Members had been European States, and it was for that reason that provision had been made in 1919 for appointing non-European countries to membership of the Governing Body. The ILO had since become a truly world-wide organisation and shifted the focus of its interest to other regions.
almost to the point of ignoring Europe's problems, and that was all the more reason for giving its membership a full and accurate account of the proceedings of a European Regional Conference. One way of doing so would be to transmit not just the texts of the resolutions but the full record of proceedings, which, though bulky, made rewarding reading and showed just how lively the debates had been.

One conspicuous shortcoming of the Office paper was that it did not properly reflect the stress placed by the Conference on such an important matter - important in particular for regions other than Europe - as the transition of young people from school to working life.

The paper also gave short shrift to the Conference's discussions of the item on working conditions and the working environment, although that too was a matter on which other regions were interested in European experience. The best way to make the information available would be to transmit the report of the competent Conference committee.

The work of the Conference Resolutions Committee had been marked by an exemplary degree of tripartite co-operation and had resulted in the unanimous adoption of resolutions on highly important subjects. That on freedom of association, in particular, touched on matters which went to the very core of ILO activities and contained a timely reminder of the vital importance to human dignity and welfare of safeguarding civil liberties such as freedom of speech and freedom of opinion. Here again, the Office paper was inadequate. In a statement at the closing sitting of the Conference the speaker had pointed to the contrast between the repression being practised in one particular country of Europe and the principles set out in the resolution. His remarks had provoked a retort which had compelled him to place on record in even more pungent terms his view that it was inadmissible to preach freedom and democracy in the ILO and treat them with scorn at home. Again the Office paper was silent and the best way to draw member States' attention to the matter would be to transmit to them the record of proceedings, No. 16 of which recorded the exchange in question.

In concluding, he wished to pay a tribute to the country where the ILO had its headquarters and where its constituents could always meet and state their views in a climate of freedom.

Mr. Naír (Government, India) gathered that the Conference had been a success, having unanimously adopted guidelines for national and international action in several important areas.

It had called for new or revised international labour standards on such subjects as the employment of the young, the social protection of workers, employment policy and the effects of technical change. Such standards were doubtless desirable, but the developing world had different priorities and needs: ending mass poverty and unemployment mattered there more than anything else.

It was cheering to see that the Conference had recognised that economic and social progress in both the advanced and the developing countries depended on co-operation between the two groups. As Mr. Sultan, the Government member of the Governing Body delegation, had said in his opening speech, joint action and far-reaching structural reform were needed to foster the economic growth of the Third World, with which the prosperity of Europe was closely bound up. The Employer and Worker members of the Governing Body delegation had also stressed the need to restructure the world economy so as to hasten social progress in the Third World and maintain its thrust in Europe. That was the key to the success of ILO efforts in the crucial years ahead.

Mr. Jiménez de Parga (Government, Spain) warmly welcomed Mr. Oechslin's remarks about the overriding need to safeguard human rights and freedoms throughout the world. In these troubled times it was gratifying to know that the ILO could now rely on the Employers' full support in defending basic human rights wherever they might be under threat. That they were far too often violated was painfully clear from the reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association.

Having had the honour of serving as Government Vice-President, he could vouch for the fine achievements of the Conference, which had tackled many problems of special interest to the Spanish Government.

Especially welcome were the suggestions for ILO action contained in the resolution concerning the problems of intra-European migration. One suggestion,
which appeared in operative paragraph 3(a), was for carrying out a comparative study of law and practice in countries employing immigrant labour. In other words, what the Conference had in mind was not just a study of legal provisions - that was a fairly easy matter - but a survey of the treatment of migrant workers in practice.

At this year's session the General Conference would be reviewing the application of the Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1989 (No. 97), and the Migrant Workers' (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (No. 143). To meet the wishes of the European Conference, however, inquiries should go somewhat beyond the traditional supervisory procedures. What was needed was a comprehensive survey, the results of which would eventually be submitted to the General Conference, and perhaps the best approach would be to hold a meeting of experts or a symposium to look into the whole subject.

In paragraph 4 of the resolution the Conference had also asked the Governing Body to keep the problems of migrant workers under review. One way of doing that was suggested in paragraph 80(b) of the Office paper, namely that the Conference's request should be borne in mind in preparing future programme and budget proposals. The Spanish Government believed, however, that it would also be useful to refer the matter to the Committee on Discrimination. After all, racial discrimination was not the only kind of discrimination: there were many others, and one was that practised against Spanish and other migrant workers in European countries.

No doubt other regions were interested to know how Europe had tackled its problems. Certainly it had solved many of them, but there were others, such as discrimination against migrant workers, which caused untold hardship and called for vigorous action.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) said that, on the whole, his Government welcomed the results of the Conference. Although the Employers and others had not been keen to hold it and the debates had often been heated, it had made a worthwhile contribution to peace, co-operation and mutual understanding in Europe.

Close co-operation between European countries was beneficial not only to Europe but to other regions as well, and particularly to developing countries, but was, of course, anathema to anyone who wanted to heighten political tensions throughout the world.

The Conference had adopted useful resolutions. In the one on young people and work it had highlighted the need for better vocational training, and in the one on the improvement of working conditions and the working environment it had wisely recommended making policy on the working environment part of economic, education and public health policy.

Another welcome text, the resolution on the ILO's contribution to co-operation in Europe, asked member States to develop co-operation "on a bilateral and multilateral basis on matters coming within the competence of the ILO", highlighted the ILO's responsibility for promoting policies for full employment and called for review by the ILO of the social and economic aspects of disarmament.

The same resolution also invited the Governing Body to consider setting up a European Advisory Committee - that might conveniently be done next year, when the other regional advisory committees were reappointed - and to convene the Fourth European Regional Conference at an appropriate time. It was indeed high time for the Governing Body to determine the frequency of European conferences, as it had already determined that of other regional conferences.

Reference had been made during the discussion to matters which had no direct bearing on the Conference, including allusions to the USSR and to Afghanistan. Ever since the victory of its revolution in April 1978 Afghanistan had been prey to direct and flagrant interference by certain countries, which had provided counter-revolutionary troops with arms, money and military training and sent them into Afghan territory. The imperialists and their lackeys had thus been waging undeclared war against revolutionary Afghanistan. Running riot in one province after another, their hirelings had massacred civilians, looted, slaughtered livestock and set fire to crops. Throughout this grim process the ILO had said nothing.

As the weeks and months had passed it had grown more and more obvious that military aggression was coming from abroad, directed by a practised hand and with a
quite definite purpose. Time and again Afghanistan had called for an end to aggression and for the peace it needed for reconstruction. Time and again Afghanistan had appealed for help from the Soviet Union, with which it had had treaties of friendship and mutual assistance since 1921, and the Soviet Government had warned that if the aggression did not stop it would go to the rescue of the Afghan people.

But the aggression had not stopped; indeed it had intensified, to the point of threatening the very independence of Afghanistan, which its enemies had sought to turn into a bulwark of armed hostility to the Soviet Union. There had then been no choice but to answer a friendly country's appeals for help and save it from the horrors that had already wracked Chile and other countries.

In appealing to the Soviet Union for help Afghanistan had invoked the explicit terms of the treaty of friendship concluded between the two countries in December 1978. The treaty was founded on "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence" which was embodied in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and which many other States had exercised when subjected to armed aggression. According to United Nations precedents the dispatch of irregular or mercenary troops against a country at peace was deemed to be an act of aggression and it was against just such aggression that the USSR Government had intervened to protect Afghanistan.

One thing should be quite plain: but for the foreign interference in its domestic affairs, neither would Afghanistan have been compelled to seek military aid from the USSR, nor the USSR to provide it. The General Secretary of the Communist Party and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, Mr. Leonid Brezhnev, had declared that the sole task of the Soviet contingents was to help the Afghans to repel foreign aggression and that they would be withdrawn as soon as the reasons which had driven Afghanistan to seek help from the Soviet Union ceased to justify it.

Allusions had also been made to Andrei Sakharov. Any serious debate on the subject of human rights should be concerned with the millions of men and women who were being persecuted throughout the world. It was outrageous to use the subject as a pretext for blatant interference in a country's domestic affairs and for sullying its good name with baseless propaganda.

For years Sakharov had tried to hinder in every way the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet Union. He made no secret of his desire to alter the socialist structures of the country. That was quite clear from many of his own statements, the text of which had in various ways been sent abroad and from there broadcast over the radio to the Soviet Union. For years his behaviour had aroused indignation among the masses, and countless appeals had been addressed to state bodies and to the press for severe measures to silence him.

As long as Sakharov's activities, pernicious though they were, had concentrated on matters of ideology, no administrative measures had been taken against him. His statements had, of course, been refuted in the press and he had incurred moral condemnation. More recently, however, Sakharov had taken to appealing for material, and even military pressure against the Soviet Union. Many examples might be given, but two would suffice. First, in an interview with the Voice of America which had been published in the American magazine Newsweek, he had advocated various types of action against the Soviet Union, including a ban on exports of technical equipment to that country and on scientific and cultural contacts. Secondly, in an interview with Mr. Buckley, a United States senator, broadcast on radio and television in November 1979, he had called for an end to exports of grain to the Soviet Union and for many other forms of pressure, such as press campaigns, demonstrations, secret diplomatic manoeuvres and trade boycotts.

In the exercise of his former activities Sakharov had had access to state secrets relating to such essential matters as the military defences of the country. He had already tried to give information to foreign powers, and it had therefore proved necessary to stop him from doing so. In the Soviet Union, as in every other country in the world, passing on state secrets to a foreign power was a serious crime, and no one could contend that to punish someone for so ruthlessly endangering the lives of millions of his fellow citizens was any restriction on freedom of speech.

In fact, Sakharov had got off lightly. In accordance with the decisions of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the public prosecutor had taken merely
administrative measures against him. Malicious rumour had it that he had been exiled or deported. In fact, he had merely left Moscow. He was now living in a four-room flat in Gorkiy, a large provincial city, and was adequately provided for. His wife was free to travel anywhere in the Soviet Union.

In short, the case of Sakharov afforded an excellent example of the humane and lenient treatment accorded by a socialist State even to those who broke its laws and threatened its vital interests.

The Chairman appealed to Governing Body members to confine their remarks to the subject under discussion.

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) felt that the Office paper adequately served its purpose of summing up the main achievements of the Conference, which had, by and large, been a success thanks particularly to Mr. Tretson, the Hungarian Minister of Labour, for his outstanding performance as its President. It had made an excellent contribution towards promoting the aims of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Although there had, understandably enough, been controversy on many subjects, the tone of debate had been objective and there had been a real determination to lend fresh momentum to regional co-operation in Europe. That determination was reflected in the many worthwhile resolutions adopted, and particularly the one on the ILO's contribution to co-operation in Europe, which contained sound guidelines for further action within the ILO's field of competence.

The Conference's conclusions should prove helpful to other regions as well—for example, its request for studies on the social and economic aspects of disarmament and its declarations on such subjects as the right to work and full employment, the working environment, and the effects of new technology on employment.

Some utterly irrelevant matters had been raised in the present debate. Mr. Kostine had already given a full reply, which the speaker endorsed.

The Government of the German Democratic Republic, while broadly endorsing the proposals in the Office paper, wished to comment on four points.

First, in Part III of the resolution on the ILO's contribution to co-operation in Europe, the Conference had asked the Governing Body to instruct the Director-General to submit "as soon as possible" the results of studies on the social and economic aspects of disarmament. All that was proposed in paragraph 75(a) of the Office paper, however, was that the Director-General should bear in mind the Conference's request in preparing future programme and budget proposals. That hardly reflected the sense of urgency which the Conference had conveyed in its resolution.

Secondly, paragraph 74 of the Office paper suggested that the Governing Body might wish to hold "at an appropriate time" a meeting of European members and deputy members to consider the possibility of setting up a European Advisory Committee. Here again, the wording of the Office proposal did not strike the right note of urgency. After all, the Second European Regional Conference, too, had called for the establishment of an advisory committee. Why could the Governing Body not decide right now that its European members and deputy members should meet in May to consider the matter? That would give all European member States an opportunity to discuss the meeting's conclusions among themselves at the General Conference in June and then the European Advisory Committee might be appointed, like the other regional advisory committees, in 1981. If no prompt decision was taken, Europe might find itself without an advisory committee for another three years.

Thirdly, it had been suggested in the debate that a special procedure should be adopted for considering draft resolutions at regional conferences. It was doubtful whether there was any need for that. The European Conference had managed to adopt many good texts and the procedure which it had actually followed was the one most conducive to co-operation between European countries with different economic and social systems.

Lastly, the Government of the German Democratic Republic believed, on the strength of the results achieved by the Conference, that such meetings had their own contribution to make to tackling social problems in Europe and to regional co-operation and should therefore be held regularly.
The discussion was adjourned to a later sitting.¹

The sitting closed at 1:05 p.m.

¹ See below, second sitting.
SECOND SITTING
(Tuesday, 4 March 1980, afternoon)

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

SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Record of the Third European Regional Conference (concl.) \(^1\)
(Geneva, 16-25 October 1979)

Mr. Pimenov (Worker, USSR) found it regrettable that the Employers' spokesman had seen fit to make irrelevant allegations in the guise of statements on the subject of human rights. Mr. Kostine had refuted those allegations in a clear and cogent reply to which the speaker, as representative of some 130 million trade union members - the vast majority of workers in the Soviet Union - wholeheartedly subscribed.

As for the proper subject of debate, i.e. the European Conference, he supported the statement made by Mr. Muhr at the first sitting and trusted that the resolutions would be fully taken account of in the Medium-Term Plan for 1982-87. For all the discontent voiced in some quarters, the Conference had on the whole been a success. Its constructive approach was evident from its unanimous adoption of conclusions on a wide range of problems within the ILO's competence. Doubtless it was open to someone who had not attended the Conference to find fault, but certainly not to anyone who had been there and had therefore presumably supported the resolutions.

Especially worth studying were the conclusions on such matters as conditions of work and the working environment, co-operation in social security, the need for a regional exchange of information on the organisation of work and the management of undertakings, the effects of new technology on employment, migrant workers, and the employment of young people.

Perhaps the most welcome resolution of all was the one on the ILO's contribution to co-operation in Europe. It contained interesting ideas about international détente and the need for closer bilateral and multilateral co-operation in Europe between countries with different economic and social systems. It contained a timely recommendation that the Office should study the economic and social aspects of disarmament and submit proposals for an ILO contribution to the work of the two competent United Nations groups of government experts. As disarmament progressed, more effective use could be made of the workforce now busy producing implements of war.

Another good suggestion in the same resolution was that the job-creating potential of economic, scientific, technical and trade co-operation should be further explored. One welcome trend would be closer co-operation between trade unions of different European countries in areas of common concern, and the idea of holding seminars and symposia of the kind suggested in paragraph 2(b) of Part I of the resolution was a sound one.

Lastly, since European regional conferences provided guidance on matters of deep concern to workers, they should be held more regularly and a European Advisory Committee should be set up.

Mr. Kysely (Government, Czechoslovakia) endorsed the Chairman's appeal to members to keep to the subject under discussion and deplored the irrelevant remarks made by some speakers, which did harm to the cause of international co-operation and understanding.

\(^1\) See first sitting.
The Conference had given rise to a constructive exchange of views among European countries with quite different economic and social systems, which had covered many social problems, including lines of future ILO action and regional co-operation. It was somewhat surprising to hear criticisms of the Office paper and insinuations that it glossed over certain aspects of the proceedings. In fact the degree of controversy and disagreement had been no greater than at the Second European Regional Conference. The Conference had heard many interesting statements, not only from delegates, but also from several ministers of labour and representatives of other international organisations, as well as from spokesmen for youth organisations, who had eloquently argued the cause of the many young people who were unemployed.

In giving effect to the Conference's resolutions the ILO should attribute priority to fostering regional co-operation between European countries irrespective of their economic and social system, especially as regards the improvement of working conditions and the working environment, social security, and exchanges of information on work organisation and the management of undertakings.

The Government of Czechoslovakia believed that a European Advisory Committee could do much to encourage such co-operation. It therefore endorsed the proposal in paragraph 74 of the Office paper and hoped that a decision on the matter might be taken by the end of 1980.

Mr. Tudor (Government, Romania) felt that European co-operation had made great strides since the Second European Regional Conference, thanks largely to the achievements of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The Third European Conference, which he had himself attended, had carried out a comprehensive and - considering the severe effects of the energy situation - timely review of the region's economic and social problems. Although there had been much hard bargaining, the resolutions had been adopted unanimously and reflected a common determination to carry regional co-operation still further. Also welcome was the recognition of the need to secure the co-operation of other regions, and particularly developing countries, in solving Europe's many problems.

As emerged clearly from the Director-General's Medium-Term Plan, one of the most challenging problems of the modern world was to find jobs for young people, and the Conference resolution on the subject was therefore timely. The whole United Nations system was concerned about the problems of youth, and as a token of that concern the General Assembly was to proclaim 1981 an International Year for Youth. The Romanian Government had suggested before that the ILO should play a leading part in encouraging international debate and consultation on how to increase and improve vocational training - one of its main and constant aims - and that would constitute a specific and worthwhile contribution to the Year.

The resolution on the improvement of working conditions and the working environment was also wellcome, particularly the suggestions for speeding up work on the International Occupational Safety and Health Hazard Alert System and for regular evaluation of the achievements of the International Programmes for the Improvement of Working Conditions and Environment (PIACT). One good idea, suggested in paragraph 36, would be to hold small regional meetings to prepare for such evaluation, presumably - in keeping with the Final Act of Helsinki - with the participation of all European States irrespective of economic and social system.

European co-operation would be promoted by the setting up of a European Advisory Committee. Such machinery already existed for all the other regions and it was only right that Europe should have a committee of its own.

As regards the economic and social aspects of disarmament, the Romanian Government had for years been urging disarmament and military disengagement in Europe, the continent with the heaviest concentration of arms, and it believed that the ILO had its own worthwhile contribution to make in that field.

Later this year a conference was to be held in Madrid to review the follow-up of the Helsinki Conference. It would be considering, among other things, the questions included in the second 'basket' of the Final Act - co-operation in the fields of economics, science and technology, and the environment - and in the third 'basket' - co-operation in humanitarian and other fields. It was only fitting that the Director-General should communicate the conclusions of the Third European Regional Conference to that meeting.
The proposals in the Office paper constituted the very least the ILO could do, considering the state of its finances and the provisions of the Medium-Term Plan, and they should be unhesitatingly adopted.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany), while agreeing with Mr. Muhr that there was no occasion for formal expressions of thanks to a host government, felt nevertheless that the ILO should be grateful for being able to hold not just the Third European Regional Conference but sessions of the Governing Body itself and many other meetings in a country which did not merely pay lip service to freedom and democracy but fully respected them in practice.

At the first sitting Mr. Oechslin had criticised the Office paper for not giving a fuller account of the Conference proceedings. However, the discussions in the Resolutions Committee - to give only one example - had turned mainly on matters of procedure, and it was doubtful whether an account of those discussions would have made worth-while reading. At the first sitting Mr. Muhr had suggested drawing up a resolutions procedure for regional conferences, but the difficulty at the European Conference had come not so much from the lack of procedural rules as from a mistaken notion that the more resolutions the Conference adopted the better. In fact the best way to achieve worth-while results would probably be to consider just a few resolutions, but to do so thoroughly, not in a small working party of the kind that had been set up at the European Conference, but in the Resolutions Committee itself.

That did not mean that the Conference as a whole should be judged negatively; and while the speaker personally had never been an enthusiastic supporter of regional conferences, he did consider that if the practice were to be continued such conferences should be held for Europe as for other regions. In any event, ways of improving the effectiveness of regional conferences generally deserved to be explored, as indeed the Director-General had suggested in the discussion on the Medium-Term Plan in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee.

Mr. Hodgkin (Government, United Kingdom) thought it no easy task for the Office to report on a meeting where there had been so much controversy. Anyone who wanted fuller information could always consult the record of proceedings, and there was therefore perhaps no need for any lengthier paper from the Office.

The reports submitted to the Conference had been first-rate, particularly the Director-General's Report, which gave an informative and enlightened survey of the problems of Europe.

What did perhaps fail to emerge from the Office paper was the amount of work that had been done by the technical committees. The Committee on Young People and Work had tellingly brought out the need for a smooth transition from school to working life, while that on Working Conditions and Environment had rightly emphasised the difficulty of squaring the need for a better working environment with economical production, economic competitiveness and the protection of employment, at the same time offering sound guidance on the sort of contribution the ILO could make in an area in which many others were active in Europe.

The resolutions adopted on subjects not included in the agenda had covered a wide range - in the opinion of some, too wide, since it had included a few topics more appropriate for treatment by other United Nations bodies. The Resolutions Committee had had a heavy workload and had barely managed to get through. The suggestion for drawing up a resolutions procedure for regional conferences, perhaps along the lines of that followed at the General Conference, might bear looking into.

The resolution on freedom of association in Europe was an especially important text; indeed the subject was drawing more attention, not less, than before.

For the time being, giving full effect to the resolutions of the Third European Conference mattered more than making plans for the fourth one. On some of the resolutions agreement had not been easy to reach, and phrases like "at an appropriate time" had had to be inserted to cover up disagreement over the urgency of the action recommended.

Mr. Ventelol (Government, France) observed that by both tradition and conviction his Government was a staunch champion of international co-operation. Evidence of that lay not only, for example, in its support for holding the European Regional Conference and the positions it had taken on questions of structure but also in the policies it had advocated and pursued in other international organisations.
As the French Government had desired, the European Conference had taken place, and its achievements were there for everyone to see.

One of the ILO's primary aims was to ensure full respect for trade union rights and for basic human rights and freedoms generally, without which the cause of international co-operation would make little or no progress. That was just one reason, but an important one, why the French Government was firmly committed to the policy of opposing any act, wherever and by whatever country committed, which led to restrictions on individual or collective rights and freedoms. In that connection events had occurred which the French Government could not but regard as deeply regrettable.

The ILO's cardinal principles were based on universal values, and only if those principles were scrupulously accepted and respected by one and all could individual and collective freedoms survive. The French Government earnestly hoped that no further harm would be done to the cause of international co-operation.

Mr. Timmer (Worker, Hungary) associated himself with the statement made by Mr. Muhr at the first sitting. As was clear from the Office paper - despite the criticisms of it expressed by Mr. Yllanes Ramos - the European Conference had been a success and had paved the way for closer co-operation in Europe.

Various matters which had no bearing on the Conference had been raised, and on the Employers' side accusations had been made which were none of the ILO's concern. Mr. Kostine and Mr. Pimenov had already made statements in reply and set the record straight.

Mr. KorrjLg, (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-chairman), who had attended as the Worker member of the Governing Body delegation, associated himself with Mr. Muhr's praise of the Conference's achievements.

In addressing the Conference he had expressed the hope that by offering guidance for ILO action on the main problems of Europe it would not only foster closer co-operation within the region but also serve the interests of the whole world, including developing countries.

Unfortunately, having heard Mr. Kostine's statement at the first sitting, he began to wonder whether his hope had been justified, and he certainly felt strong sympathy with some of the remarks made by Mr. Oechslin. One of the resolutions unanimously adopted at the Conference had related to freedom of association and human rights, and another had referred to disarmament. Although as a rule the Workers did not hold with discussing matters which fell outside the ILO's competence, international tension undeniably had an adverse effect on the ILO's work. The USSR Government must therefore realise that its intervention in Afghanistan was not conducive to international co-operation ...

Mr. Pimenov (Worker, USSR), raising a point of order, observed that Mr. Morris was not speaking to the item under discussion. Did he, moreover, claim to be expressing the views of the Workers' group?

Mr. Hawke (Worker, Australia) understood Mr. Morris to be speaking for at least a majority of the Workers' group.

Mr. Macha (Worker, Tanzania) observed that the irrelevant political matter which had again been raised had not been discussed in the Workers' group and he appealed to the Chairman to see to it that the debate did not stray from the subject before the Governing Body.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-chairman) did not consider his remarks irrelevant. The ILO's overriding aim was to defend the basic rights and freedoms both of individuals and of communities, and when they came under threat the Chairman of the Workers' group had every right to express views which were held by the majority of that group.

He often found it distasteful, as a member of the Committee on Freedoms of Association, to join in condemning some countries for infringing trade union rights while others, no less guilty, went scot-free. The ILO had a solemn duty to defend the rights of all workers, wherever and under whatever sort of rule they might live, especially when they could not plead for themselves, and he would let no one, with specious points of order, prevent him from speaking out. Any country that committed
an act of aggression should stand condemned, and he would condemn that country even if it was his own. No one who really wanted international détente and co-operation and disarmament could condone aggression.

The free press of the Western world gave a version of events in Afghanistan that contrasted sharply with the one just offered to the Governing Body. Some would retort that the Western press was given to twisting facts, but in this instance he felt sure that history would record that it had struck close to the truth.

What the representative of the USSR Government had sought to defend was indefensible. One could only hope that in the next few weeks or months the people of Afghanistan would once again be allowed to govern themselves and free from rule imposed from abroad...

Mr. Pimenov (Worker, USSR), again raising a point of order, objected to Mr. Morris's remarks as irrelevant to the subject under discussion.

The Chairman said that out of courtesy he wished to allow speakers to finish their statements, but once again urged them not to stray from the subject.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman), continuing his statement, observed that over the years, as a member and then as the Chairman of the Workers' group, he had consistently protested against any breach of human rights and against flagrant violation of the right to self-determination, freedom and sovereign independence of any people.

He would remind Mr. Pimenov that for years the Workers' group had resolutely fought in defence of the workers and trade unionists of Chile, who had been murdered, tortured, imprisoned and suffered all manner of persecution. Were the workers of Afghanistan any less deserving of support? True, there were no known trade unions in Afghanistan; but the workers had rights, the people had rights, and it was up to the ILO to defend them. To shirk that duty would be a betrayal of everything the Organisation stood for. Without freedom of speech and of opinion, what could the ILO achieve? There was nothing treasonable about dissent from the views of government: indeed it was only because workers had been free to dissent and had demanded their due that in some countries they were now able to enjoy the fruits of their own labours.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) was much impressed with the achievements of the European Conference and particularly welcomed its recognition - recorded in paragraphs 15 and 16 of the Office paper - of the mutual dependence of Europe and other regions and of the need for fairer distribution of the benefits of development between all countries and for a new international economic order.

Co-operation for development could be achieved only in a world at peace. Some speakers had referred to recent events in south-west Asia. The Government of Pakistan had not intended to raise the matter, which had already been discussed in the United Nations General Assembly, at the recent conference of Islamic foreign ministers and elsewhere. It could not, however, accept the explanation given for the military intervention by a world power in the territory of the sovereign, independent and non-aligned State of Afghanistan. It stood to reason that no government was likely to call in foreign forces to bring about its own destruction.

The whole international community had deplored the intervention and called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all foreign forces from Afghanistan. The Government of Pakistan hoped that that call would be heeded without delay.

Mr. Lloyd (Worker, United Kingdom) set store by all the Conference resolutions and thought it wrong to favour any one of them at the expense of others. Some of the matters raised in the present discussion might have been better dealt with under another item, since they were obscuring the Conference's achievements.

Endorsing what Mr. Morris had just said about human and trade union rights, he trusted that effect would be given to each and every one of the resolutions, in particular by making suitable provision in the Medium-Term Plan.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) detected in what Mr. Jiménez de Parga had said at the first sitting a suggestion that the Employers were interested in protecting trade union rights in some countries, but not in all. Nothing could be further from the truth. In the past thirty-odd years the Committee
on Freedom of Association had dealt with a thousand cases, of which scarcely half a
dozens related to freedom of association for employers. In not a single case had
the Employers been obstructive, nor would they ever be, whatever the difficulty.

Mr. Mocha (Worker, Tanzania) observed that, especially in the past decade, the
ILO had often been accused of undue preoccupation with politics. Developing
countries in particular had been told that if they wanted to discuss politics they
should go to the United Nations, and it was on the grounds of "politicising" of
the ILO that a world power had withdrawn from membership.

The item under discussion had nothing to do with Afghanistan. Yet allusions
to events in that country kept intruding, and they had been made by Governing Body
members from the very countries which on former occasions had rebuked developing
countries for "politicising" the Organisation. Much had been said about Afghanistan
elsewhere, and the ILO was not the place in which to discuss the matter all over
again.

Tanzania and Tanzanian workers cared as deeply as anyone did about human
rights, which were of course one of the ILO's main concerns. But if armed
intervention was a fit subject for discussion in the ILO, why had the Governing Body
never discussed the acts of aggression committed by Amin of Uganda against Tanzania?

Mr. Aqeed (Worker, Pakistan) warmly congratulated those who had taken part in
the European Conference on their achievements and the Office on the reports it had
prepared for the Conference's guidance.

The resolutions on such topics as the employment of young people and the
improvement of the working environment were of as much interest to Asia and other
developing regions as to Europe. As Mr. Sultan, the Government member of the
Governing Body delegation, had said in opening the Conference, joint action and far-
reaching structural reform were needed to overcome the economic and other problems
of the Third World, with which Europe's prosperity was closely bound up: the extent
of poverty outside Europe was still quite appalling, and Europe should play a fuller
part in meeting the developing countries' basic needs.

Indeed, in Africa, Latin America and Asia, the most populous region of all,
unemployment and grinding poverty were widespread, and they would never be brought
to heel until the world achieved a new international economic order, a fairer
distribution of its material resources and the type of international division of
labour which had been advocated by the World Employment Conference.

The workers of Pakistan were striving to foster the economic and social
progress of their country with the meagre resources at its disposal. At the same
time they fervently believed in respecting the freedom and sovereign independence of
all peoples and in preserving friendly relations with other nations, including
Pakistan's neighbours - Afghanistan, China, India and the Soviet Union. Although
Pakistan had its own critical economic and employment problems, its workers felt
deep sympathy with the plight of the Afghans - over half a million of them - who had
been driven to seek refuge in their country and they earnestly desired to see
conditions in Afghanistan return to normal so that the refugees could go back home
and determine their own future in freedom and independence.

As Mr. Khan had said, the military intervention in Afghanistan had been
roundly condemned by the United Nations General Assembly and by the conference of
Islamic foreign ministers. The workers of Pakistan heartily espoused the cause of
their persecuted comrades, whether in Chile or in Afghanistan or anywhere else, and
added their own voice to those condemnations.

Mr. Hawke (Worker, Australia) said that as an Australian he was understandably
loath to take part in a debate on a European Conference, but some speakers had made
remarks which he could not allow to go unchallenged.

The suggestion had been made that Mr. Morris was not speaking on behalf of the
Workers' group. The speaker wholeheartedly endorsed what Mr. Morris had said and
felt sure that the majority of the Worker members did so.

He was astonished at the attitude of some Governing Body members, who fondly
imagined that they were free to pass judgement on other countries but bridled at the
slightest criticism of their own. No one was free to rebuke unless he stood rebuke
himself.
Mr. Oechslin's remarks at the first sitting in reference to the resolution on freedom of association, and Mr. Morris's statement in support, were in fact quite germane to the item under discussion. It the sixth preambular paragraph of the resolution, in which, humanist, the Conference had explicitly affirmed that the normal exercise of trade union rights depended on respect for such civil liberties as "the right to freedom and security of person and freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention" and "freedom of opinion and expression and in particular freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers".

Mr. Kostine had sought to refute Mr. Oechslin's allegations and in doing so had exercised a right which no one had tried or wished to deny him. Yet his reply had been remarkable mainly through the amazingly implausible arguments he had used.

Mr. Kostine had contended that the Soviet Union had responded to an appeal from the Government of Afghanistan, a State with which it was on friendly terms. The appeal had been made, so it was said, on 26 December 1979, and must therefore have come from the former President, Amin - the namesake, by the way, of another notorious but now vanished figure. It would be interesting to hear from Amin what he thought of the sequel to his appeal. Unfortunately he was no longer there to give his views, having been got rid of, not by the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States - no one in his senses would suggest that - but by the self-styled "friendly" power itself. It therefore made no sense at all to pretend that it had just been a case of one sovereign independent nation appealing for friendly help from another.

Just why the Soviet Union had intervened was a moot question. Perhaps it, too, had felt it neede "secure and recognised boundaries" - to borrow a phrase from Security Council Resolution No. 242 - and had imagined that the best policy was to get an invitation to intervene from someone in the neighbouring country and then dispose of him.

A calm was now settling on parts of Afghanistan, but it was the calm of death, and the people's dreams of freedom and democracy lay shattered. The facts spoke for themselves, and there was no gainsaying them.

Mr. Kostine had tried to defend the Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan by invoking a treaty for mutual assistance concluded in 1921 between the two countries. That sort of argument should serve as a dire warning to any country that might think of concluding a treaty of alliance with the Soviet Union: it would do well to remember what had happened to Hungary, Czechoslovakia and now Afghanistan, all of which had been blessed with such treaties with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Macha had asked why the Governing Body should discuss events in Afghanistan when nothing had been said of the acts of aggression committed against Tanzania by Uganda under the leadership of Amin. The point was - and Mr. Morris had made it well - that respect for human rights must be universal, and that was why Afghanistan was a proper subject for discussion.

It would be sheer hypocrisy for European member States to adopt unanimous resolutions about human rights in Europe and at the same time acquiesce in Soviet action in Afghanistan. Universal respect for human rights was the very foundation of the ILO, and one of those rights, freedom of association, was a cardinal ILO principle. The ILO stood for the unfettered right of everyone to join with others who had the same ideals and aspirations to strive together in a common cause, and it had a duty to defend that right whenever and wherever freedom was in peril.

Mr. Oechslin had also spoken of Andrei Sakharov. Mr. Kostine had protested that the treatment of Sakharov was "lenient" and "humane": that he had simply moved from Moscow to Gorkiy, that his wife was free to visit him, and more in like vein. But was such treatment compatible - to quote the resolution - with "freedom to impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers"? In fact its sole purpose was to deny Sakharov just such freedoms - and, unfortunately, he was not alone in that sorry position but was one among tens of thousands.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) fully subscribed to the noble sentiments expressed by Mr. Ventejoi and, like him, earnestly hoped to see all obstacles removed from the path of international co-operation.

Whatever disagreement might mar the present debate, the European Conference had paved the way for closer understanding and co-operation between the two parts of
Europe and full effect should be given to its excellent resolutions, which had been adopted unanimously.

The Conference's recommendations were to some extent reflected in the Medium-Term Plan. But the Plan was more an exercise in social theory than a plan of action, and the Italian Government hoped that in his next Programme and Budget proposals the Director-General would do his utmost to make full provision for suitable action.

Mr. Nuss (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) endorsed Mr. Morris's statement, which in his opinion was quite relevant to the item under discussion and, as Mr. Hawke had said, reflected the views of the majority of the Worker members.

Part III of the resolution on the ILO's contribution to co-operation in Europe spoke of disarmament. Many delegates at the Conference had had quakes about that, not because they were opposed to disarmament, but because the subject bred dispute. In the end the references to disarmament had been included, and the text as a whole had been adopted unanimously. That was what made the discrepancy between what it said and recent events all the more striking.

Mr. Jiménez de Parga (Government, Spain) felt that Mr. Oechslin had perhaps misunderstood the remarks he had made at the first sitting. He had never wished to suggest that the Employer members were cool towards freedom of association. On the contrary, he was delighted to hear them now so zealous for ensuring respect for trade union rights by governments of all political hues.

What had prompted his earlier remarks was that their attitude seemed to have changed. In former days they had been slow to condemn openly even the most flagrant breaches of freedom of association, even though some of them had intimated their abhorrence in private.

He knew from experience what it was like to live in a country without freedom. Under Franco there had been no genuine freedom of association in Spain; yet seldom, or so he gathered from reading the records, had disapproval been heard from the Employers' benches.

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) wished to point out, in response to Mr. Jiménez de Parga, that the Committee on Freedom of Association had in fact made many recommendations to the Governing Body roundly condemning the breacher of freedom of association in Spain under Franco. It had made them unanimously - in other words with the Employers' agreement - and they had been endorsed by the Governing Body - again with the Employers' support. The Governing Body had also set up a group of senior diplomats to study the trade union situation in Spain and had adopted the group's far from indulgent findings unanimously - again with support from the Employers' group.

Mr. Kysely (Government, Czechoslovakia) deplored the political drift of the discussion and in particular some allusions to his own country, which he could not allow to pass unanswered.

The years between the two world wars had been years of hardship for Czechoslovakia. While seeking to achieve freedom and democracy, it had faced mass unemployment and had seen half a million of its citizens emigrate, including some 300,000 to the United States. To protect its sovereign independence it had contracted alliances with many other countries, including one concluded with the Soviet Union in 1935 by the Beneš Government. Later, in 1938, it had seen just how little some of those alliances were worth when it had been handed over to Hitler under the Munich agreement.

The people of Czechoslovakia had learnt the cruel lesson of history and after the Second World War had resolved to abandon the foreign and domestic policies of the First Republic. With the economy and the country in ruins, there had been a million unemployed. Exercising their right to self-determination and without military pressure from any quarter, the people had, in the elections of 1948, freely chosen the path they wished to follow. Their choice had not pleased everyone, and, as the debate in the Governing Body had shown, was still unpalatable to some. But Czechoslovakia had at last found the right path and had chosen its allies accordingly, and they had lent it unfailing political, economic and social support over the years.
Today there was no unemployment in Czechoslovakia, and the future of its young people was assured. It did have difficulties, but its basic social problems had been solved; it was advancing in freedom and democracy, as a sovereign independent State.

Political wrangling in the Governing Body did nothing towards solving Europe's economic and social problems. It was "politicisation" of the Organisation that had prompted the United States withdrawal - albeit "politicisation" of a rather different kind, arising in effect from the defence of revolutionary and democratic movements, whereas in the present situation such movements were actually under attack and the rights of sovereign States were being treated with scorn.

Mr. Koack (Government, German Democratic Republic) was sorry to see the Governing Body, instead of calmly debating the Conference's achievements, being treated to pronouncements quite out of tune with the spirit that had marked the Conference.

If the insults hurled against Afghanistan and the Soviet Union were anything to go by, there was still support in some quarters, perhaps even more than before, for meddling in Afghanistan's domestic affairs, and the purpose was certainly not to further any aim of the ILO's.

The Government of the German Democratic Republic fully endorsed Mr. Kostine's statement.

Mr. Villanes Ramos (Employer, Mexico) drew attention to a statement he had made on 25 October 1979 at the closing sitting of the Conference, which was recorded in Provisional Record No. 16. In that statement he had invited the Government of Czechoslovakia to explain how it could bring itself to support the resolution on freedom of association when it was itself guilty of the wholesale breaches of human rights widely reported in the world's press.

The Government of Czechoslovakia had not deigned to offer any explanation, and it was odd, to put it mildly, to hear Mr. Kysely now take other Governing Body members to task for indulging in slanderous accusations. The accusations were unfortunately true and Mr. Kysely ought to be thankful that the question of violation of human rights in his country had not been pressed further.

All this merely strengthened the case for transmitting the full record of the Conference proceedings, together with the resolutions, to member States.

Mr. Tanaka (Worker, Japan) fully endorsed Mr. Morris's statement, which represented the views of the majority of the Worker members, and expressed deep anxiety about the plight of workers in Afghanistan and a fervent hope that they would be allowed full exercise of their human and other rights. As Mr. Hawke had said, free and democratic trade unions could survive only when full civil liberties were safeguarded: that was the conviction underlying the Conference's resolution on freedom of association.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) deplored the tendentious and provocative turn which the discussion had taken and the deeply prejudiced attitude shown by some towards socialist countries.

They had never uttered a word in protest against the recent military invasions of African countries or against the gross violations of the sovereign independence of Viet Nam; yet they felt free to bandy about the groundless allegations about Afghanistan that were rife in the Western press.

Mr. Hawke, who lived on the other side of the world, fondly believed that he knew more about what was going on in that country than did the Soviet Union, its neighbour and ally. The fact of the matter was that the Afghan Government had made no fewer than 14 appeals for help, and even then the Soviet Government had decided only after careful thought to go to its aid. Mr. Hawke might speak with irony of the Soviet Union's treaties with other countries, but it had treaties of friendship, co-operation and non-aggression with many countries and prided itself on abiding by them faithfully.

It was inadmissible to hear such gross slander in the Governing Body against a sovereign member State and to see the ILO's objectives held in such small account. It was unfortunate that the Chairman had not called Mr. Hawke to order.
Mr. Pimenov (Worker, USSR) also found the drift of the debate distasteful. He regretted that the Chairman had not taken up his objections to Mr. Morris's remarks and called speakers to order for departing from the subject.

The Chairman observed that no one had raised objections either to Mr. Oechslen's alluding to Andrei Sakharov or to Mr. Kostine's replying. He had therefore seen no reason to rule Mr. Morris's statement out of order; indeed he had felt bound by courtesy to allow Mr. Morris to finish, just as he had allowed Mr. Kostine to answer Mr. Hawke, and Mr. Pimenov, too, to speak on questions with little direct bearing on the European Regional Conference.

Perhaps regrettable things had been said, but anyone who wanted to speak of human freedoms should normally be given his say, and others allowed to reply.

Mr. Pimenov (Worker, USSR) explained that he had not wished to question the Chairman's conduct of the debate, but merely to draw attention to his earlier ruling that remarks should be addressed to the agenda item.

The Director-General, replying to the debate, thanked Governing Body members for their kind words about the Conference arrangements and the Office reports. He had indeed been most anxious that his own report should give a fair and full picture of Europe's economic and social problems.

The Conference had gone well and had adopted some fine texts, but perhaps, as some had said, the Office paper was somewhat jejune and did not, in particular, accurately reflect the disagreement which had arisen on some topics. Such papers had aroused criticism before, though seldom so sharp, and the Office would consider reporting or regional conferences more fully in future.

A suggestion had been made for transmitting the full Conference record, but the sheer bulk of it argued against widespread circulation. At the Governing Body's last session copies had been made available at the distribution desk; they were still there.

The Office would take full account of the debate in giving effect to the Conference resolutions. It would do its utmost to take prompt action and would, so far as possible, make suitable provision in the programme and budget proposals for the next biennium.

Governing Body members had joined issue on the subject of human rights. That was little wonder in an Organisation which saw freedom as universal and indivisible and for 60 years had been campaigning for it world-wide. The debate had at least pointed up the need for the ILO to pursue its aims with even firmer resolve. Certainly, although all the texts were important, the debate suggested that the resolution which went to the heart of the ILO's concerns was indeed the one on freedom of association, which contained a wealth of ideas of interest to all regions.

One recommendation in the resolution especially worth noting concerned the carrying out of studies of the trade union situation and industrial relations in European countries, and preparatory work was already under way in the Office. At the European conference, at the Eleventh Conference of American States Members in Medellin and elsewhere in the last few months the Director-General had had occasion to speak of the constant and perhaps even increasing violations of Convention No. 87, a basic ILO instrument ratified by over 100 countries. That brought home the topical importance of the resolution, and he earnestly appealed to Member States for the co-operation and support without which the Office could not hope to carry out the studies asked for in an effective way. In the meantime he could assure the Governing Body that he would be submitting proposals for such studies to it in due course.

Mr. Oechslen (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), for the Employers, asked whether the record of the debate could be transmitted as well as the texts of the Conference resolutions.

The Director-General said that that would be done in due course.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 42 of the Office paper.
Mr. Horras (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman), for the Workers, proposed inserting "and the employers and workers" after "European member States" in paragraph 48(a).

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the Employers agreed to that amendment.

With that amendment, the Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 48 of the Office paper.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 57, 61, 63, 65 and 69 of the Office paper.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), speaking for the Employers, referred to the recommendation in paragraph 74 for holding a meeting of European members and deputy members of the Governing Body to examine the possibility of setting up a European Advisory Committee - a recommendation intended to give effect to paragraph 3(a) of Part I of the resolution on the ILO's contribution to co-operation in Europe.

Meetings of that kind had been held before, for example to prepare for European regional conferences, but they had no official status. Was it right to refer to such a meeting a matter which the Governing Body as a whole, including members from other regions, had to decide? The Employers had no objection to considering the idea of setting up an advisory committee - they had agreed to the resolution - but they felt that a better approach would be to ask the Director-General to consult the European members and deputy members and report back.

As for the words "at an appropriate time" in paragraph 74, they reflected the intention of the Conference, and the Employers were in favour of keeping them.

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) also felt that, although it was for the Governing Body to decide whether a European Advisory Committee should be set up, it would be a good idea to have the Director-General consult its European members; and indeed all European member States and report back on such questions as the size and terms of reference of the proposed committee.

The regional advisory committees were to be reappointed in 1981 and, if the intention was to appoint one for Europe, that would be the best time to do it. The Governing Body's session in May and the General Conference in June would afford appropriate occasions for consulting European member States. The Governing Body might then take the matter up again in November and still have time to iron out difficulties before reaching a final decision at its spring 1981 session.

Mr. Lloyd (Worker, United Kingdom) expressed the Workers' support for the recommendations in paragraphs 73, 74 and 75 of the Office paper.

The Director-General, to meet Mr. Oechslin's point, suggested that instead of adopting the recommendation in paragraph 74 the Governing Body might invite him to consult the European members and deputy members of the Governing Body on the possibility of setting up a European Advisory Committee and to report back to it at the appropriate time.

It was so agreed.

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) pointed out that, in Part III of its resolution on the ILO's contribution to co-operation in Europe, the Conference had asked the Governing Body to instruct the Director-General to present as soon as possible the results of his inquiries into the social and economic aspects of disarmament. All that was proposed in paragraph 75(a) of the Office paper was that he should bear that suggestion in mind in drawing up programme and budget proposals.

If, as he understood it, the Director-General was to submit specific proposals to the International Organisations Committee in November, paragraph 75(a) was acceptable. If not, the wording should be amended to call for speedier action on a matter which ought not to be deferred any further.

The Director-General saw no difficulty: if the International Organisations Committee had a paper on the subject before it in November, the Office could take
account of the Committee's views in the programme and budget proposals for 1982-83, which it would be working on at about that time. Perhaps Mr. Noack could therefore agree to the wording of paragraph 75(a).

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) expressed satisfaction with the Director-General's explanation.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 73, 75, 78 and 80 of the Office paper.

The sitting closed at 6.40 p.m.
THIRD SITTING
(Wednesday, 5 March 1980, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.20 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Dottrep.

THIRD ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers
(Paris, 19-23 November 1979)

Mr. Nakatani (Government, Japan), after paying tribute to the work of the Committee of Experts, referred to the section of its report concerning the allegation of the Japan Teachers' Union that current social security practice in Japan conflicted with paragraph 53 of the Recommendation. The allegation seemed to be based on a misunderstanding. Under Japan's school health law the school authorities had to carry out annual preventive medical examinations of all the teachers in their schools. The teachers were not charged for those examinations, which were fully equal in quality to those provided for public service personnel and for workers in other sectors under the occupational safety and health law. The standards specified in the paragraph referred to were therefore fully met, and there was no basis for saying that the system of medical examinations for teachers in Japan was in conflict with the Recommendation.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed the Workers' support for the recommendations in paragraph 11 of the Office paper.

The Workers welcomed the Committee's intention of involving international and national teachers' organisations more directly in the procedure for supervising the application of the Recommendation.

As regards the updating of the Recommendation, that should not be allowed to result in a lowering of its standards, and the Director-General should make this quite clear to those engaged in the relevant consultations.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) observed that, while the Recommendation dealt with the whole question of the status of teachers, the Committee's agenda had seemed more concerned with their rights than with their obligations. At the same time, he had noted with satisfaction that the Committee had, in its general discussion, pointed out that there were other factors than remuneration which determined the social status of teachers and the prestige they enjoyed.

In reply to a question from Mr. Oechslin, the representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) said that the questionnaire prepared by the Committee of Experts contained a special section covering educational establishments in the private sector, thanks to which concrete information would be collected on the situation in that sector.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 11 of the report.

FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Meeting of Members of the Panel of Consultants on Workers' Education
(Geneva, 26 November-5 December 1979)

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed the Workers' full support for the excellent report produced by the Consultants. The Panel performed
a highly useful function within the ILO structure and its meetings were an important means of providing guidance for the Workers' Education Programme, which was one of the fundamental programmes of the ILO. The Workers' group supported the areas of action mentioned in the report and agreed with the over-all approach outlined in paragraph 87. They particularly agreed with the view that, to be effective, workers' education had to be carried out by the workers' organisations themselves. That meant that the ILO Workers' Education Programme should be implemented in direct co-operation with the international and national workers' organisations, a proviso that was especially important in countries where freedoms of association and basic trade union rights were systematically violated.

The Workers' group would like to see the Programme strengthened, especially with respect to its action for rural workers, which could constitute a major contribution towards rural development in the developing countries, and for certain other groups such as women workers, young workers and migrant workers. There should be a sufficient number of workers' education advisers operating in the field, and the Workers' Education Programme should be associated more actively with the carrying out of other technical programmes. The Panel of Consultants should also meet more frequently.

As regards the report itself, the Workers' group considered that it should be sent directly to the workers' and employers' organisations instead of being transmitted through governments, and the recommendation in paragraph 6(b) of the Office paper should be amended accordingly.

Mr. Hujumdar (Government, Bangladesh) also considered the report an excellent one which identified priority needs and made practical recommendations. His Government supported all the Panel's recommendations and approved the points for decision in paragraph 6 of the Office paper.

While fully endorsing the views expressed by Mr. Morris and agreeing, in particular, that prime responsibility for workers' education lay with the workers' organisations themselves, he considered nevertheless that appropriate consultations with the government and with employers' organisations could be beneficial. In the interests of the Programme itself, and to avoid duplication of effort, some sort of government co-ordination might in some cases be necessary, particularly when there were several trade union federations at national level.

As regards areas of concentration, it would be useful to add to those listed in paragraph 89 of the report adult literacy programmes for workers, which could give them a better understanding both of the problems at their workplace and of the social and economic problems in the national context. The areas proposed in paragraphs 90 to 92 were all very important, but perhaps three of them should be given priority: assistance to the efforts of trade unions to train their members to make effective use of their organisations - a matter of particular importance in many developing countries -, developing teaching aids in local languages, having regard also to local social and economic characteristics - since filmstrips or other teaching aids developed in a foreign context had little impact on the workers locally - , and developing regional or other facilities of an instructor training nature that would have a multiplier effect in implementing workers' education programmes.

Finally, the Government of Bangladesh fully supported the recommendation in paragraph 93 regarding the need to increase the resources available for the Workers' Education Programme. The Eighth Asian and the Fifth African Regional Conferences and the Eleventh Conference of American States had all adopted resolutions calling for an increased proportion of ILO regular budget income to be earmarked for that programme.

Mr. Omodovle (Government, Nigeria) saw in workers' education a useful instrument for more effective collective bargaining and he congratulated the members of the Panel on their excellent report.

With regard to paragraph 87(e), while his Government had no objection to the ILO workers' education activities being carried out in consultation with the national and international workers' organisations, it hoped that the appropriate government ministries would be kept informed.

On paragraph 93, he agreed that a greater proportion of ILO regular budget income should be made available to the Workers' Education Programme.
He also agreed with the proposal in paragraph 94 that the Panel of Consultants should be enlarged to allow for more equitable regional representation.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) fully agreed that workers' education was essentially a responsibility of the trade unions and that the governments and the ILO had to help the unions to perform that function effectively. He had been somewhat perplexed, however, to read in paragraph 87(a) of the report that workers' education could only be effective when workers had freedom of association and their organisations could operate freely. While that statement was fundamentally correct, the matter was not quite so simple in reality. To be sure, there were some countries which deliberately rejected freedom of association and where there could be no hope at all of developing workers' education in the spirit of the present report; but there were also countries which, simply because they were still in the process of building up their social institutions, did not yet enjoy full freedom of association or even have a trade union structure, and to take a rigidly negative attitude towards such countries might well kill the chicken before it was hatched, since workers' education was often a first step towards effective trade union organisation and true freedom of association in the ILO sense of the term.

In paragraph 87(b) there was a discreet mention of population education. That too was an important task, and problems connected with the demographic explosion should be brought to the attention of all concerned, particularly the workers and their organisations.

In paragraph 92 there was a reference to the training of instructors - again an essential task, and one in which, it might be added, the Turin Centre could play a part.

The report also mentioned the problem of migrant workers, who, despite language barriers or other impediments, should, like others, have the benefit of paid educational leave provisions. A number of countries - Canada, in particular - had done much to give immigrant workers access to workers' education programmes on an equal footing with nationals of the country.

As to the specific action now to be taken, the Italian Government supported the appeal for additional resources for the ILO Workers' Education Programme. The recommendation in paragraph 6(c) of the Office paper might be made more concrete by specifically requesting the Director-General to take the various suggestions into account in preparing programme proposals for the 1982-83 Programme and Budget. The amendment to the recommendation in paragraph 6(b) proposed by Mr. Morris was also acceptable.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) endorsed the recommendations in paragraphs 89 to 92 of the report. He also agreed with Mr. Falchi and Mr. Omoyele regarding paragraphs 87(a) and 87(e).

Priority in the Workers' Education Programme should be given to schemes that aimed at covering all workers and at helping them to pass their knowledge on to others. The ILO should therefore encourage workers' organisations to start their own workers' education programmes, thus extending the reach of the movement to the vast majority of workers.

His Government supported the proposals for assistance to rural workers, with particular emphasis on self-help activities, and for increased efforts on behalf of migrant workers.

It also believed that additional resources should be made available to the Programme, but these should be chiefly spent on practical field programmes since staff increases did not necessarily mean more workers' education.

Mr. Nair (Government, India) felt that the report placed workers' education in its proper perspective, outlining priority areas and putting timely emphasis on rural workers, migrants and young workers - sectors that had been relatively neglected in the past. It was important for workers' education programmes to encourage the development and operation of self-help ventures by unions since that was one way of strengthening the unions financially and helping their members.

India attached great importance to workers' education, and a systematic programme had been developed by a tripartite Workers' Education Board, under which more than 52,000 instructors had been trained in 41 centres throughout the country. The
Board gave financial assistance to trade unions for their training programmes and it had developed a special programme geared to the workers' education needs of people in rural areas. There was still a need for external assistance, however, and the Indian Government particularly endorsed the appeal in paragraph 93 of the report for increased regular budget allocations to the Workers' Education Programme.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) pointed out that the "prime responsibility" of workers' organisations in workers' education matters, referred to in paragraph 87(d) of the report, was not the same thing as "exclusive responsibility". Workers' education in its broadest sense was not solely trade union education, and in many countries the employers participated in workers' education programmes.

The Employers had always held that exercises such as this one, in which those who benefited from a given programme were called upon to state their needs, constituted a sound approach which could be used in other cases, e.g. the programme of assistance to employers' organisations. Participation in such meetings was not, of course, tripartite but they did have the merit of providing guidance for the Conference and the Governing Body reflecting the needs of those directly concerned by certain programmes.

Mr. Naldo (Government, Philippines) agreed with previous speakers on the excellent work done by the Panel of Consultants.

With regard to the education of rural workers, one of the areas of concentration listed in the report, the recommendation concerning the development of teaching aids based on local languages and social characteristics was a very important aspect of the Workers' Education Programme, particularly for some of the developing countries which often had to cope with a large number of languages or major dialects. In the Philippines there were some 87 such dialects, for instance, and to provide teaching aids in all of them was very expensive. That was a reason for allocating more funds to the Workers' Education Programme in the next programme and budget.

As workers' education was a national priority in the Philippines, it was gratifying to note that the Panel included two consultants from that country.

Mr. Tata (Employer, India) considered workers' education as important for the employers as for the trade unions, and he shared the Workers' positive assessment of the Consultants' report.

Mr. Morris's point that trade union leaders should become increasingly interested in the rural areas was well taken, since workers' education was in fact a means of developing among workers a greater sense of responsibility and a better understanding of collective bargaining. The process should therefore be encouraged, even if rural employers were likely to offer more active resistance than employers in the industrial sector. In that context, it was worth while reminding those who opposed programmes for employers based on a similar educational approach of the contribution which such programmes could make towards fostering a greater sense of responsibility among employers in the developing world.

It was somewhat surprising that the report did not refer more explicitly to the role of workers' education in helping trade union leaders to rise from the ranks. While in many developing countries "outsiders" might admittedly have an essential part to play during the trade union formative stages in order to protect illiterate workers who were ignorant of their union responsibilities and the collective bargaining process, one of the purposes of the workers' education programmes described in the report ought surely to be to minimise the role of outsiders in the long run and to ensure that the rise of rank-and-file members to leadership positions should be a continuing feature of the trade union movement.

Although India was a country in which workers' education had taken firm root it appeared that no Indian consultant had taken part in the meeting. Could an explanation be given?

Mr. Mainwaring (Government, Canada) agreed with all that had been said by Mr. Morris, including the proposal that the report should be sent direct to the employers and workers instead of through governments.

Canada attached great importance to workers' education programmes, and Mr. Falchi's complimentary references to its efforts in that area were particularly gratifying.
Like previous speakers, he believed that the resources devoted to the Workers' Education Programme needed to be increased, even at the expense of some of the research work done under other programmes at headquarters. Workers' education was a practical programme in which the ILO had every hope of making an impact.

Mr. Ben-Israel (Worker, Israel) endorsed Mr. Morris's statement and commended the Office for the fine work it was doing in workers' education.

Paragraph 87(a) of the report said that workers' education could be most effective when the trade unions had freedom of association and operation and that ILO action should be concentrated on countries where those conditions obtained. Yet the countries where workers' education was most needed were usually those in which freedom of association and trade union rights were not respected. The Office should find ways and means of having direct contacts with such countries and thus help to promote workers' education for those workers who were most sorely oppressed and most critically in need of ILO support.

The importance of workers' education for young people seemed not to have been properly stressed in the consultants' recommendations. Young people were not always imbued with the spirit of trade unionism and did not know much about it, so they, too, should constitute an area of concentration.

Referring to remarks made by Mr. Tata, Mr. Mehta (Worker, India) said that there was an Indian trade union representative on the Panel but that he had not been able to attend the 1979 meeting.

With regard to paragraph 87(a), ways and means of helping workers in places where they did not have full trade union rights did indeed constitute a difficult problem to which a solution had to be found. Direct contacts had been suggested but there might be other ways as well, which the ILO should explore.

Mr. Tata had mentioned the problem of the "outsider" in the trade union movement, and it was true that the practice had given rise to some difficulty. In India considerable emphasis was given to what was termed the constitutional trade union movement, and resort to arbitration and, ultimately, to compulsory adjudication was increasingly frequent. For such procedures the workers needed to be represented by experts. There was less fear today of victimisation, but there were still psychological inhibitions to be overcome. Both employers and workers tended to have more respect for the outsider than for even highly qualified people who had risen from the ranks, and it would take much work and quite a lot of educational effort to overcome that problem.

Language difficulties also had an impact on the "outsider" problem, at least in a country like India where almost all administration was carried out in a language that was foreign to employers as well as to the workers. When a worker replied to a charge-sheet he had to reply in a foreign language to accusations that were also expressed in that language, and both the charge-sheet and his reply could become documents in a court of law. Ignorance of the language might make him write something that could cause trouble for him later on, so he had to be very careful. The ordinary worker was not equipped to cope with such problems, and he needed to be represented by somebody who was both technically and linguistically qualified.

This situation was repeated at various levels - tribunals, tripartite meetings, and so on. A strong educational effort was therefore needed, involving not only the trade unions but also the government and the employers, so that the workers might have a better understanding of texts affecting them - including laws, regulations and communications by the employer - and be in a better position to defend their interests.

In concluding, the speaker expressed support for the consultants' recommendations and commended the workers' education activities of the Office.

Mr. Ahmed (Worker, Pakistan) endorsed the views expressed by Mr. Morris and Mr. Mehta.

He agreed that the ILO should decentralise its workers' education activities, as proposed in paragraph 33 of the report.

In paragraph 85 it was suggested that the regular budget resources to assist workers' education institutions in developing countries should be increased, and he looked forward to the implementation of that recommendation.
Regarding the question of paid educational leave, raised in paragraph 83, it was to be hoped that those member States and employers who were not yet providing paid educational leave facilities would do so in the interests of workers' education.

Mr. Mehta and others had spoken at some length about the "outsiders" in the trade union movement. In most countries, including the industrialised countries, the outsider had come originally from the rank and file; he had usually been an active organiser at a time when the forming of unions was not tolerated; he had been thrown out of his job but the trade union had chosen nonetheless to retain his services. Yet the fact remained that most trade union leaders came from the rank and file. It might be added that the existence of the outsider in the trade union movement did not in any way contravene the provisions of Convention No. 87, according to which workers should be free to choose their own representative.

As was indicated in paragraph 56 of the report, rural education should be viewed in relation to land reform.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) said that the ILO had always stressed the importance of education and training as the cornerstone of social progress and the basis for solving social problems. It was a matter not just of equality of opportunity but development of the personality, freedom of opinion and generally enabling the individual to participate effectively in the social process. That aim could not be achieved simply by producing a New International Economic Order: the social order in each country had to be structured, and it was in that area that education and training, including particularly workers' education, could make such an important contribution.

Mr. Aziz Farag (representative of the Organisation of African Unity) asked whether workers from countries still under foreign domination, like South Africa, might not be added to the categories - i.e. women, migrants and young workers - mentioned in paragraphs 62 to 65 of the report as those in regard to which the ILO should make a special effort to provide workers' education. That would undoubtedly be very helpful to them.

Replying to the various points raised, the representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) said that the meeting had dealt with an ILO programme that had been steadily growing over the years. It had, as Mr. Oechslin had said, confirmed the value of an approach designed to enable the ILO to maintain close touch with a programme's beneficiaries. It had been a serious and businesslike meeting that had come to grips with the essentials of the question before it.

The Office had taken careful note of the emphasis placed during the Governing Body's discussion on the needs of such categories as rural workers, women, migrant workers and young people and of the other comments made on the report.

Mr. Falchi could rest assured that the ILO did have a substantial population education programme, aimed largely at the trade unions and their members.

So far as the question raised by the representative of the OAU regarding national liberation movements was concerned, the ILO had already lent assistance to such movements; in particular, a very successful series of seminars on workers' education had been organised for them.

The need for developing workers' education programmes in full consultation with the trade unions was obvious; at the same time, consultations with government circles and with employers regarding various aspects were also necessary and did take place in practice.

As Mr. Majuddar had rightly pointed out, it was essential to concentrate on action that would take full advantage of the multiplier effect, such as the training of local instructors. The development of teaching aids and materials in local languages, adapted to local backgrounds, was also very important, although the proper role of the ILO should probably be to create a capacity for producing such materials locally, e.g. through national agencies responsible for workers' education, rather than to produce them itself.

Regarding Mr. Tata's point concerning the membership of the Panel, there were two Indian consultants on it. One of them had been invited to the meeting but had been unable to attend.
As to the recommendations in paragraph 6 of the Office paper, the report could be sent direct to the workers' and employers' organisations, as suggested by Mr. Morris, and the recommendation in subparagraph (c) could be strengthened as proposed by Mr. Falchi.

Mr. Sangtong (Government, Thailand) felt that all workers' education activities could benefit, in terms of speed and efficiency, from consultation and co-operation with governments. That idea might be added to paragraph 87(e) of the report by inserting, in line 3, the words "and with the national authorities" after the words "international workers' organisations concerned".

Mr. Walcott (Worker, Barbados), dissenting, observed that in some parts of the world there would be vehement protests if each and every workers' education activity had to be undertaken in consultation with the government. Workers' education had to be carried out freely, untrammeled by government interference. If education was to be directed at all, in the specific case of workers' education it should be directed by the workers' organisations. The workers were intellectually capable of giving the right orientation to their educational programmes.

Some degree of decentralisation was needed in workers' education structures. These provided training of a kind not readily available in conventional educational establishments, in particular training in industrial relations - a process which the complexities of modern industrial life and of world social and economic structures had profoundly altered. Trade unionists today needed a far better and more complete knowledge of the total society in which they lived and operated, and the ILO, through its workers' education programme, could make a valuable contribution in that regard.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) supported the views expressed by Br. Omoyele and Mr. Sangtong. It was the duty of a government, without wishing in any way to screen trade union activity, to keep informed of what the international workers' organisations were doing at the national level; indeed, it was in the workers' interest that it should do so.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman), further to the views expressed by Mr. Walcott, stressed the need for workers' education programmes to be free, untrammeled and unfettered. Trade union education was a matter to be dealt with within the trade union structure, with the assistance of the ILO, which had a great deal of expertise in the matter.

In reply to what Mr. Khan had just said, it might be pointed out that governments were in fact aware of what was taking place since workers' education programmes were developed within the ILO and were open to the scrutiny of any member of the Governing Body or any member State.

It was in the enlightened self-interest of all people within a State - whether in government, employer or worker circles - that there should be representative workers' organisations in tune with the times, effective in the service of their members and technically qualified in the matters with which trade unions were concerned. That meant not only organisational matters but also such technical fields as administration, negotiation, the development of social programmes and the operation of the economy as a whole. These were subjects within the purview of the ILO Workers' Education Programme, and there was nothing secret about them. Active government involvement in workers' education programmes, however, was another matter and tended to defeat this very purpose by making them suspect in the eyes of the workers.

The programmes under discussion were in no way subversive, as had been hinted. The speaker himself would be the first to criticise them if they were, because subversive programmes would not improve the image of the ILO or the ILO's effectiveness in programme development and execution. In his long years of association with workers' education programmes he had sometimes clashed with officials of his own Government, but the conflict had been over differences of opinion and had nothing to do with subversion. Government opposition to workers' education programmes probably originated in a lack of understanding of their true purpose, which was to develop the intelligence of workers, their ability to understand how their country operated, and the meaning of freedom and of democracy. Without that understanding, the system could survive. Those who criticised the report and felt that it provided insufficient safeguards for governments ought perhaps to look into the situation in their own countries and
examine the bases for their suspicions. The report as it stood was an accurate reflection both of the present situation and of what should be the guidelines for future activities under the ILO Workers' Education Programme.

Mr. de Icaza (Government, Mexico), agreeing with Mr. Morris, fully endorsed the report in its present form. As regards paragraph 87(e) in particular, no one could object to the consultations with workers' organisations, at both the national and the international level, which it advocated, and governments seeking information could always obtain it through the Governing Body.

Mr. Osowale (Government, Nigeria) had not meant to suggest that governments should be actively involved in workers' education programmes, but merely that they should be informed. If the ILO were planning to develop a workers' education programme for the Nigerian Labour Congress, for instance, it would be only common courtesy to inform the Ministry of Employment and Productivity.

Mr. Barnabo (Worker, Togo) agreed with Mr. Morris that government participation in workers' education programmes could create difficulties for the workers. In his own country there was a full-time workers' education centre for which the Government had agreed to bear the operational costs within the framework of its adult education programme. It was the trade unions alone, however, that had power to determine the centre's training programmes. The unions were best suited for that role since they knew best what the various requirements were. The system worked well, and recently the ILO had been asked to assist in organising a course of retraining for the instructors at the centre. The ILO was therefore fully conversant with the programme being operated in Togo, which afforded a good illustration of the point made by Mr. Morris, namely that such programmes should be run by the unions themselves and that government participation in drawing up the programmes could only complicate matters.

Mr. Hari (Government, India) observed that paragraph 87(e) of the report, as worded, did not appear to preclude ILO action through governments, and that government intervention was in fact needed in the preparation of requests for technical co-operation. That did not mean that the government could issue directives to national trade unions regarding their workers' education programmes. At the same time, the trade unions in many developing countries had limited resources and looked to the government for financial and other assistance. Adequate consultation with governments on programmes in which they had a direct interest would help to ensure that the programmes operated smoothly.

Mr. Sangtong (Government, Thailand) was prepared, in view of the discussion, to withdraw his earlier proposal, which he had made only because he believed that consultation with governments would help workers' education programmes to run smoothly.

Mr. Naldo (Government, Philippines), reaffirming his Government's interest in workers' education, which was in line with the interest it took in educational programmes generally, said that it had appropriated millions of pesos for the establishment of workers' education programmes, setting up a labour education centre for the purpose as part of the government-run University of the Philippines.

Perhaps a generally satisfactory rewording of paragraph 87(e) of the report might consist of inserting the words "and the government, if engaged in workers' education" after the word "concerned" in the third line, so that the text would read: "All ILO workers' education activities should be carried out in close cooperation with the national and international workers' organisations concerned and the government, if engaged in workers' education, and wherever possible efforts must be ...". A government had in any case to be consulted if it was itself intensively engaged in workers' education activities, as was the Government of the Philippines, which had in fact pioneered the workers' education movement in the country.

Mr. Saboia (Government, Brazil) agreed that the development and implementation of workers' education in a country, with participation of international and national trade union organisations, necessarily presupposed consultations with the government.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) pointed out that the wording of paragraph 87(e) merely reflected ILO practice. Moreover, the report under discussion was the report of the Meeting of Consultants and it was not for the Governing Body to change it. The only recommendation for Governing Body action was
that in paragraph 6 of the Office paper, and it alone could be amended. Undoubtedly the Director-General would take due note of the suggestions in the meeting's report as well as those that had been made during the present discussion.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) agreed with Mr. Oechslin: the Governing Body could approve the report, disagree with it or comment on it, but could not amend it. The discussion had been very interesting and would no doubt afford valuable guidance for the ILO Workers' Education Programme.

The Governing Body took note of the report of the meeting and authorised the Director-General to forward it to governments of member States and to the employers' and workers' organisations, to the international intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations concerned, including the non-governmental organisations with consultative status, and to any other interested bodies.

The Governing Body also requested the Director-General to take account of the suggestions in paragraphs 86 to 95 of the report in drafting proposals for ILO action in workers' education within the framework of the preparation of the 1982-83 Programme and Budget.

FIFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report on the Government Conference for the Final Adoption of a Second Revised Agreement concerning the Social Security of Rhine Boatmen

(Geneva, 27-30 November 1979)

Mr. Zenger (Government, Switzerland), speaking for himself as well as for Mr. Verschueren and Mr. Clivaz, the two other members of the Governing Body delegation to the Conference, said that the very succinct paper before the Governing Body referred to a long, complex, highly modern and indeed exemplary instrument, the outcome of long, careful work by highly qualified experts. He hoped that copies of the text would be made available to those members who wished to consult it.

The Governing Body delegation had been struck by the competence, cordiality and open-mindedness of the participants. The work done by the Office staff had been remarkable, and congratulations were due also to the Administrative Centre of Social Security for Rhine Boatmen, whose expert assistance had contributed largely to the successful outcome.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) regretted that the Office paper did not provide a synthesis of the improvements that had been introduced in the new Revised Agreement. The only technical comment it contained was to the effect that the Revised Agreement was a considerable improvement on the previous text. The addition of only two or three more paragraphs could have given an idea of what these improvements were.

It did seem, at any rate, that considerable progress had indeed been made, which would benefit not only the workers of the signatory powers but all workers employed in Rhine navigation.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) said that the new Agreement was probably the most modern and comprehensive multilateral social security agreement in existence. For one thing, it covered not just workers who were nationals of the signatory States but others as well. It was also comprehensive in terms of benefits: sickness, maternity, invalidity, old-age, survivors', employment injury, occupational diseases, death, unemployment, and family benefits were all included. The exercise bore eloquent testimony to the quality of the technical services which the Office could provide for other organisations in matters of social security.

One strikingly innovative feature of the new Agreement, for example, was the manner in which it contained two quite different approaches to the provision of children's allowances, based respectively on the principle of responsibility of the country of employment of the worker and that of the country of residence of his
dependants. It was always easier, of course, to regulate such complex issues through agreements of limited scope. The present Agreement was an attempt along such lines and he hoped it would be signed and ratified by all concerned.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Advisory Committee on Rural Development on its Ninth Session
(Geneva, 27 November-6 December 1979)

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) wondered whether, given the increasing emphasis being placed by the ILO on rural development - in line, no doubt, with the needs of the developing countries - it was adequately equipped, in terms of its structure, for doing the job. If the ILO were to continue to expand its activities in that sector, it would probably be advisable to develop the machinery available for the purpose and, to that end, review the composition of the Advisory Committee on Rural Development as well as the frequency of its meetings.

Rural development was a very complex subject, and the problems it raised varied from country to country far more widely than those associated with the urban, industrial sector. The function of the ILO in that area should therefore be essentially to help each country develop the kind of rural structure most likely to result in improved agricultural production, i.e. to assure the population's food supply as well as the social advancement of its agricultural workers. To achieve that objective there was no single valid formula; yet the Office had exhibited in the recent past, both in connection with the meeting now under discussion and on other occasions, a somewhat disturbing tendency to favour openly a particular approach in matters of rural development or agrarian reform. The Office should take care in such cases to provide not only competent but also impartial advice.

Mr. Issifu (Worker, Ghana) expressed the Workers' agreement with the Committee's conclusions and recommendations. His group also accepted the report as a whole, which gave a true picture of the discussions and in particular, in paragraphs 72 and 73, of reservations recorded on both the Employers' and the Workers' side.

Admittedly, the Workers would have preferred to adopt stronger conclusions and recommendations, but in a spirit of tripartism and democratic compromise they had agreed to a milder text that did not involve a sacrifice of basic principles. The report reflected the views and respected the interests and aspirations of all three groups, and as such should be approved by the Governing Body.

The Committee had urged the ILO to "develop and implement practical projects designed to improve the situation of the rural poor" and to do so by encouraging their own active participation. That indeed was the very essence of the ILO's work to promote the economic and social progress of rural peoples.

As to Mr. Oechslin's remarks about agrarian reform, it was obvious that such reform was a prerequisite for any meaningful economic and social development. Admittedly there was, as Mr. Oechslin had pointed out, no single formula that could be adopted for all countries; but neither was it correct to accuse the Office of having sought to impose its own views, as would be clear from any objective assessment either of the working documents placed before the Committee or of the recommendations contained in its report.

On the substance of the report, the Workers endorsed the Committee's recognition of the special needs of women in rural areas, which implied an ILO commitment to strive to meet those needs, as well as its appeal for steps to secure better terms of trade for primary commodities produced in developing countries, which would have a positive impact on the life of the people. There was also a need for tackling other problems mentioned by the Committee as likely to militate against adequate food production, e.g. those associated with distribution systems, nutrition and health.
The Workers endorsed the Committee's request for more frequent meetings. A five-year interval between sessions was too long.

In discussing the key role of employment promotion in relieving poverty, the Committee had urged the strengthening of programmes for creating productive employment. That, too, was a recognised field for ILO action and should have the support of all three groups.

Mr. Lukutati (Government, Zambia), fully supporting the previous speaker's remarks, said that rural development was one of the ILO's main tasks and that the Advisory Committee deserved to be commended on its report. In Zambia and other developing countries rural development had a high priority in national programmes to meet the basic needs of the people.

An important problem in the present context was to help countries to improve their data base for planning purposes, especially at the village level, by developing rural village or district "profiles" to which the rural people themselves contributed and in whose analysis and use they actively participated. That involved simplifying appraisal, monitoring and evaluation programmes so that the data could immediately be used by the persons concerned.

It was most important that the ILO should continue to allocate resources to rural development activities, to which the developing countries themselves were committing substantial funds.

The discussion was adjourned to a later sitting.¹

The sitting closed at 1 p.m.

¹ See fourth sitting.
FOURTH SITTING
(Wednesday, 5 March 1980, afternoon)
The sitting opened at 4.35 p.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Pontsop.

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA
Report of the Advisory Committee on Rural Development on its Ninth Session (concl.)
(Geneva, 27 November-6 December 1979)

Mr. Omoyele (Government, Nigeria) congratulated the Committee on its report and recommendations. His Government fully supported the Committee's recommendation, recorded in paragraph 7 of the Office paper, that, as an ILO input for the shaping of the New International Economic Order, studies should be extended to the alleviation of poverty and the promotion of employment through an improvement of the terms of trade for primary products so as to raise the incomes of agricultural workers and producers in developing countries. The international community had not given this important matter sufficient attention.

The ILO regular budget allocation for rural development should be steadily increased. In Africa, for instance, 70 to 80 per cent of the population lived in rural areas and, if the influx to the cities was to be stemmed, development in rural areas was essential.

The report unfortunately omitted to elaborate the role which national governments could play in rural development, particularly in providing the necessary infrastructure - a subject which was squarely within the Committee's terms of reference.

Finally, the recommendation in paragraph 43 of the report that workers' organisations should be consulted in the formulation of rural development projects deserved support, but such consultation might usefully be extended also to farmers' associations as well as to government ministries with responsibilities for local and community development.

Mr. Tata (Employer, India) shared the disappointment felt by a number of Asian participants in the somewhat one-sided approach reflected in the papers which the Office had prepared for the meeting. The ILO seemed to be seeking justification for its activities more from the views expressed at the FAO Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development than from its own thinking, and its reports for the Committee were dominated by such ideas as the imposition of ceilings on the size of private holdings, the encouragement of group farming and state-owned farms, and the creation of systems of broad-based community control.

Admittedly, these were important factors in the context of rural development for analysing and redressing the causes of rural poverty, but they were not the only factors and should not be overemphasised. The speaker personally attached great importance to agrarian reform and was fully prepared to acknowledge the action governments were already taking to bring it about, but it would be wishful thinking to imagine that repeated resolutions in international fora would have miraculous results for agrarian reform in developing countries. It had become fashionable to use the Committee as a vehicle for political propaganda for agrarian reform even though a number of member States had no need for it. Agrarian reform was a legitimate subject for debate, but only as long as the debate did not degenerate into an ideological conflict about the establishment of an egalitarian society.

In practice, even where agrarian reform had taken place poor farmers had not automatically shed their poverty. Unsound government, poor fiscal policies, lack of

1 See third sitting.
water resources, lack of credit facilities, fertilisers and insecticides — all of these were obstacles to alleviating rural poverty; no agrarian reform scheme could by itself be regarded as a panacea.

Rural development was the most effective way of bridging economic disparities between the dominant and dependent sectors of the world. It was the only answer to the problems caused by urbanisation and widespread unemployment. By diverting more resources to action-oriented programmes and strengthening staff resources, the ILO should continue its active and objective interest in rural development. Social justice had to be extended beyond industrial labour to the masses of non-industrial and non-organised rural workers, whose problems remained the greatest immediate priority.

H.E. H'Polo (Government, Angola) congratulated the Committee on its grasp of the major problems of rural development.

He supported the points of view expressed in the report under the heading "Poverty and employment in rural areas of the developing countries" and wished to highlight the determining role of governments in shaping their countries' development. It was not sufficient simply to recognise the importance of rural development; governments should also work out practical programmes so that it received the attention it merited. Consequently, an important criterion and an indispensable condition for ILO assistance in the rural sector should be the indication of a definite willingness on the part of governments to take specific rural development action.

H.E. Konané-Fronte (Government, Ivory Coast) wished to see the Organisation bring its weight to bear in the struggle for improving terms for exports of agricultural products from developing countries. Deteriorating terms of trade, particularly as regards prices for coffee and cocoa, were key elements in hindering the development of countries such as his own. He supported the recommendation in paragraph 21 of the Office paper and found the report itself highly satisfactory.

H.E. Kabbie (Government, Sierra Leone) commended the report, which made it clear that without effective rural development in developing nations urban centres would have immense difficulty in coping with the social ills bred by the massive influx of people from rural areas in search of employment, social amenities and better living conditions.

As proposed in paragraph 4 of the Office paper, increased emphasis should be placed on anti-poverty and employment-oriented programmes in rural areas. The alleviation of poverty in developing countries depended in particular on securing better terms of trade for primary commodities, a matter which the Committee had usefully stressed and which was referred to in paragraph 7 of the Office paper.

H.E. Hajumder (Government, Bangladesh) stressed the overriding importance of rural development in a country such as his own, where over 90 per cent of the population lived in rural areas plagued by massive unemployment and underemployment and where a priority objective was to develop income-generating activities to the point where every member of the economically active population could make a contribution to over-all socio-economic development. Bringing employment to the rural areas would, at the same time, help to prevent the drift to urban centres which was tending to transform them into slums.

ILO activities to benefit rural workers, though increasing, were still too meagre. The Organisation should become far more deeply involved in programmes to create productive employment and improve working conditions in rural areas, including further studies of rural development policies likely to promote those objectives. These studies should have due regard to the need for adapting the approaches, policy instruments and planning techniques to the circumstances of each situation, and in particular the agrarian system in effect. International terms of trade were closely linked to the success of poverty alleviation programmes and inevitably affected the income and living standards of agricultural workers; that element too should be covered in the studies to be undertaken.

The special needs of women with family responsibilities should be properly considered when formulating future ILO programmes for rural development since there could be no progress worthy of the name unless women, who made up half of the population, played an active part in development.
Finally, a substantial increase was needed in the research allocation for rural development; that would bear witness to the ILO's concern for the rural population and possibly attract outside help for its work in that area.

Mr. Khalfi (Government, Egypt) appreciated the work being done by the ILO in studying rural poverty and exploring policy options for achieving a pattern of rural development characterised by social justice.

An important component of the ILO's work in that area was the study of agrarian reform as an instrument of rural development. A mandate for such study already existed in international labour standards, notably the Tenants and Share-croppers Recommendation, 1968, and the conclusions of the 1976 World Employment Conference. The ILO study on Egypt which had been presented to the Advisory Committee was objective and highly illuminating for policy makers. It would be translated into Arabic for wider distribution.

The ILO should continue its efforts to develop sound policies for rural development as a means of eliminating poverty.

Mr. Végh Garzón (Employer, Uruguay) congratulated the Committee on the thoroughness and excellence of its work and endorsed the proposals in paragraph 21 of the Office paper.

There was, however, one subject on which, coming as he did from a region seriously hampered by economic problems in its attempts to achieve rural development, he found the report unsatisfactory.

In paragraph 13 of its conclusions the Committee had acknowledged that changes in world markets for primary products had an impact on the incomes of agricultural producers and workers and it had rightly concluded that the alleviation of poverty partly depended on improvements in the terms of trade for exporting countries, especially developing ones. It had therefore recommended enlarging ILO studies to cover that subject as a contribution towards establishing the New International Economic Order.

It was a great pity that the Committee had not gone further and discussed the harmful consequences for the developing economies of some of the policies of the European Economic Community. To cite but one example, under its common agricultural policy the Community, by means of subsidies, guaranteed to the producer far too high a price for milk and other produce. The result was huge surpluses and dumping. Yet milk was something which Uruguay and other Latin American countries were quite able to produce for export to Europe at competitive prices. In the meantime the prices they obtained for their agricultural and dairy produce were ruinously low - sometimes a mere third of the cost of production. Whatever the New International Economic Order might be - and no one had ever explained it very clearly - it must at all costs mean fairer terms of trade for the developing world.

At its next session the Committee - on which some Members of the European Economic Community were represented - should look into that problem much more closely.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) agreed with the Committee that attention should continue to focus on anti-poverty programmes, particularly employment promotion and training, and that better terms of trade were needed for agricultural exports from developing countries. ILO studies on that subject would indeed be welcome. Other sound recommendations - reported in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Office paper - were for technical co-operation between developing countries, whether in the same or in different regions, as well as inter-agency co-ordination and expansion of ILO co-operation with the International Fund for Agricultural Development and the World Food Programme.

However, the Government of Pakistan shared the reservations expressed by the Employers in the Committee about the recommendation, mentioned in paragraph 20 of the Office paper, for giving priority in ILO activities to certain countries.

Lastly, a cautious approach should be taken to agrarian reform. The subject was a highly political one, and ILO involvement might sometimes be misunderstood. Moreover, agrarian reform sometimes led, as the Employers had said in the statement recorded in paragraph 11 of the Committee's report, to fragmentation and marginalisation of agricultural holdings.
Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) felt, on reading the report, that ILO research, counselling, technical co-operation and standard setting in regard to rural development had proved effective and should be developed further. It was gratifying to see that recent ILO activities had been aimed at relieving poverty in rural areas, especially in the least developed countries. The government of the Federal Republic of Germany was keenly interested in schemes for rural development, particularly research in matters of rural employment, labour-intensive programmes, and studies of the vocational training and conditions of life and work of women in rural areas.

As the Committee had recognised, there was no single and self-evident solution for such problems as poverty, employment, training, the profitable use of waste land, and the conditions of life and work of women in rural areas, because of the great diversity in the structure of national economies, but the Committee had set helpful guidelines for the future ILO action foreshadowed in the Medium-term Plan. The ILO should continue to work closely in that field with international and national institutions, but of course success would come only if the countries themselves showed determination in coming to grips with the social problems of rural areas.

Issifu (Worker, Ghana) wished to correct any impression some Governing Body members might have that the Office had tried to impose its own ideas on the Committee. The material submitted by the Office to the Committee had in fact been useful and objective, and had won a great deal of praise.

Nor had the Committee regarded land reform as a panacea for rural problems. On the contrary, it had seen land reform as simply one means, though an important one, of improving the lot of rural workers.

Mr. Ben Israel (Worker, Israel) welcomed the ILO's growing interest in rural development, which was one of the main objectives of the modern world. Unfortunately, only a few countries had ratified or were respecting the ILO's instruments on rural workers' organisations, and such organisations seldom participated as fully as they should in efforts to achieve rural development. It would therefore be interesting to hear what action the Director-General intended to take, as the Committee had recommended, to secure more ratifications of those instruments, particularly Conventions Nos. 87, 99 and 141, as well as the application of Recommendation No. 149.

Mr. Nair (Government, India) welcomed the Committee's interesting and useful report. In India and many other countries land reform was not necessarily the way to reduce mass unemployment, and it was therefore encouraging to see that the Committee had advocated generating employment by promoting non-farming activities and rural industrialisation. Here the ILO had a vital part to play, for example by holding workshops, seminars and other meetings of a practical kind at which rural workers themselves, and not just government planners and administrators, could exchange information on the problems of rural development. Such meetings had a useful "multiplier" effect. One example was the workshop which the ILO and the World Crafts Council were to hold in Bangalore towards the end of 1980, and at which craftsmen from Asian countries would have an opportunity to confer upon matters of common concern.

It was somewhat disappointing, on the other hand, to note that the Committee had suggested a number of projects for research into rural problems on which the countries themselves already had an ample stock of information. It would be more helpful if the ILO and other international institutions such as the FAO collated that information before embarking on further ambitious research.

Another way of enhancing the usefulness of ILO action would be to give effect to the Committee's recommendation for carrying out operational programmes to improve the lot of the poor by ensuring their active participation. The ILO should consider carrying out, over limited periods, integrated programmes for full employment and the relief of poverty in specific areas in various countries, based on surveys of the resources and skills available in those areas and on studies of appropriate technologies.

The Indian Government had misgivings about the Committee's recommendation that the ILO should give assistance as a matter of priority to countries with a clear
commitment to policies for the relief of poverty and to freedom of association for rural workers. How was such a commitment to be determined? Such an approach might prove self-defeating and would be at odds with the ILO's mandate, which was to promote the social progress of all mankind.

Lastly, unless the international economic structure was reformed, development efforts would be of little avail; hence the vital importance of bringing about the New International Economic Order.

Héctor González Martínez (Government, Mexico) congratulated the Committee on its report and the Office on its paper, which afforded an excellent basis for discussion of a programme of action to promote development and full employment in rural areas.

Rural development was indisputably a principal objective in most countries, and by that was meant the elimination of poverty and unemployment and a fairer distribution of the fruits of development—in a word, social justice—for those who lived in rural areas.

One of the main methods for achieving that objective was to aim not just at a redistribution of the land but also at changes in the structure of land tenancy. One of the fundamental beliefs which had prompted the Mexican revolution was that the land should belong to those who tilled it and depended on it for their livelihood.

Rural development should also be seen in the context of the ILO's basic-needs strategy. The world food crisis was assuming terrible dimensions, and the ILO should therefore keep in close touch with the work of the World Food Council, which was at present studying ways of increasing world food production and naturally had to bear in mind the question of employment in rural areas.

There was one of the Committee's recommendations that the Mexican Government could not endorse, namely the one—recorded in paragraph 16 of the Office paper—for carrying out studies on the effect of the changing role of women and improvement of education on demographic problems. True, as the Committee had said, population pressure had adverse effects on rural incomes. But these effects were suffered by men as well as by women, and in any event the ILO's competence in that field was limited. The only competent body was the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council, to which the Advisory Committee's recommendation would have been more appropriately addressed.

The Director-General felt sure that in this case no one could find fault with the report for being too bland or lacking in substance, reflecting as it did the Committee's lively debates on many controversial topics, it made stimulating reading.

Differences of opinion had been expressed in the Committee about the ILO's proper role in rural development. Undoubtedly that role was a large one, and should be strengthened, as had been affirmed time and again in recent years by the General Conference, by the World Employment Conference in 1976, and by the Governing Body itself in 1977 in its in-depth review of rural development and again in 1979 in evaluating the follow-up to the World Employment Conference.

Another subject which was unquestionably of concern to the ILO was agrarian reform. As the report made clear, there had been sharply divided opinions in the Committee on that subject, but one idea had been widely accepted both in the Committee and in the Governing Body, namely that agrarian reform was only one means among many of hastening rural development. That was clearly affirmed in paragraph 9 of the Committee's conclusions, and the report afforded not only food for thought but also a basis for vigorously developing ILO programmes for the rural sector.

As for the material which the Office had submitted to the Committee, and which had prompted some comment, it had been based on information drawn from a wide range of sources, and every attempt had been made to make sure that it was objective, well balanced and complete.

The rural development programme had made sure and steady progress in recent years, with allocations from the regular budget as well as from extra-budgetary sources. There were at present 21 projects totalling $12 million being carried out, and a further 29 projects totalling $26 million were "in the pipeline". Especially striking was the development of public works programmes in rural areas—
Bangladesh and other Asian countries, for example - which, it was hoped, would help greatly in expanding employment. Such programmes were financed under bilateral aid, and the ILO owed a deep debt of thanks to such countries as the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland for their substantial support. Thanks were also due to the UNDP and the World Food Programme for providing extra-budgetary resources.

In reply to Mr. Ben Israel, who wished to know what action he envisaged to encourage further ratifications of instruments vital to rural development, the Director-General said that he intended to make use of all constitutional means at his disposal, such as the Article 19 reports procedure, the inclusion of the subject of standards in the agenda of regional advisory committees and regional conferences, and efforts under workers' education programmes and programmes for assistance to employers' organisations to bring home the importance of ratifying the instruments mentioned by Mr. Ben Israel.

In that connection, it was worth pointing out that there had been a recent shift in the emphasis of programmes towards the rural and unstructured sectors, in which there was inadequate social protection. That did not mean, however, that the industrial sector was being overlooked. A proper balance had to be struck between the various sectors, and that was a matter which the Governing Body would have the occasion to look into next February when it debated the programme and budget proposals for 1982-83, in which the Office would take full account of the Advisory Committee's conclusions and recommendations.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 21 of the Office paper.

SEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Meeting of Experts on the Revision of the List of Occupational Diseases Appended to Convention No. 121

(Geneva, 14-22 January 1980)

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed the Workers' support for the proposals in paragraph 14 of the Office paper, and especially for the experts' recommendation, recorded in paragraph 11, that the ILO and the WHO should continue their research into occupational diseases with a view to updating the list of diseases appended to Convention No. 121.

The list of diseases having now been revised by the experts, it was vital for the Conference to take the further action required and for the Office to ensure widespread publication of the list so that those working with toxic substances or in unhealthy conditions were made fully aware of the grave and often concealed dangers.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 14 of the Office paper.

EIGHTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Meeting of Experts on Statistics of Employment Injuries

(Geneva, 21-25 January 1980)

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed the Workers' support for the proposal in paragraph 6 of the Office paper on the understanding that the revised draft international recommendations for statistics of employment injuries would take account of all the suggestions made at the meeting.
Because of the serious practical consequences, particularly for social security schemes, it was important to define clearly the scope of the recommendations to be adopted at the 13th International Conference of Labour Statisticians, and to avoid confusion between "occupational" and "employment" injuries. The latter term was used in the covering note, whereas the former, which appeared in the experts' report, was incorrect. The Conference should not, as had the experts, exclude consideration of statistics relating to occupational diseases and accidents suffered by workers while commuting to and from the workplace.

The Workers set great store by the experts' unanimous recommendation that information on matters of prevention and safety should be exchanged in cases of transfer of technology. They endorsed the proposal in paragraph 31 of the report that a handbook on methodology for collecting statistics should be issued and they hoped that funds for the purpose could be found. They supported the experts' proposals for research by the ILO and at the national level and hoped that as a result of the International Conference of Labour Statisticians more countries would make their statistics available to the ILO.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) observed that the harmonisation of statistics on employment injuries and occupational diseases was a very complex matter and that unfortunately little progress had so far been made, even at the regional level. In Europe, for example, despite considerable efforts the progress was disappointing.

Accordingly, if the report facilitated the work of the labour statisticians' Conference, the Employers would be well satisfied. Although the Conference would not be tripartite in composition, presumably there would, as usual, be representatives of non-governmental organisations and circles, who might express their views.

The proposal in paragraph 29 of the report - that safety and health information should be exchanged in cases of transfer of technology - was somewhat surprising. In itself it was unexceptionable, but it did not seem to be specifically related to the subject of employment injury statistics.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) supported what Mr. Morris had said on a very interesting report and agreed with Mr. Oechslin about the difficulty of harmonising employment injury statistics, although it was certainly a worthwhile endeavour.

Unfortunately, the proposals in paragraph 6 of the Office paper seemed hardly adequate to give effect to the meeting's three main recommendations as set out in paragraph 31 of the report, namely that every country should establish a focal point to improve the quality and coverage of statistics, that the ILO should become a clearing house for information on methodology for collecting statistics on occupational hazards, and that a handbook of such methodology should be issued. In future ILO programmes account should be taken of all three recommendations.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) reaffirmed the importance the Workers attached to the recommendation in paragraph 29 of the report that information on prevention and safety should accompany the transfer of technology, particularly that of new types of machinery. In Canada, for example, many injuries had been caused by failure to observe proper safeguards in using such machinery, simply because the country of manufacture had not supplied adequate safety information. It was vital for the suppliers to give full information on the sort of safeguards required - legislation on the subject had now been introduced in Canada - and the experts had been quite right to make a recommendation to that effect.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) explained that the Employers did not disagree with the recommendation as such: they merely thought that it was not strictly relevant in a report which was concerned with the subject of statistics.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 6 of the Office paper.

The sitting closed at 6.15 p.m.
The sitting opened at 10.30 a.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Dontsop.

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF GOVERNING BODY COMMITTEES

The Clerk of the Governing Body announced nominations of the Employers' group regarding the composition of Governing Body committees. The Employers proposed that, for the Industrial Activities Committee and the Committee on Operational Programmes, Mr. Hafez should become a regular Employer member; that, for the International Organisations Committee, Mr. Habib should become a regular Employer member; and that, for the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee as well as the Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, Miss Hak should become a substitute Employer member.

The Governing Body approved these nominations.

NINTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

International Centre for Advanced Technical and Vocational Training

The Governing Body noted that no paper was before it under this item of its agenda.

TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Activities of the International Occupational Safety and Health Information Centre (CIS) in 1979

The Director-General introduced Mr. Herbert Siegel, successor to Mr. Guy Juvet, who had recently retired, as head of the Centre. Mr. Siegel was assuming responsibility for an operation to which the Governing Body rightly attributed major importance, in a field where the ILO had a clear mandate.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed the Employers' satisfaction with the specific and comprehensive report which had been presented. The steady expansion in CIS activities was evidenced by the rise in the number of subscriptions, and the Centre was increasingly making use of modern means of disseminating information. The Employers wished the new Director every success in his work and expressed their confidence in him.

The Governing Body took note of the Office paper.

ELEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) said that the Committee, having had 53 cases before it, had reached final conclusions in 12 and interim conclusions in 13 of them.

See GB.211/PV (Rev.), p. IX/11.
The Introduction to the 199th Report appealed to certain governments, which had not provided information or observations as requested, to do so without delay. In some of the cases before the Governing Body information had been received either too late or on the eve of the Committee's meeting. As regards Chile, for example, the Committee had asked the Government to supply information on the trade union organisations and on collective bargaining legislation and the practical application of it, as well as on the detention of trade unionists, so that the case could be examined as a whole at its next meeting. As regards Poland, the Government had stated its intention of inviting a representative of the Director-General to visit the country for a general review of the instruments ratified, aimed at finding solutions to the problems encountered in their application.

The Committee had examined the cases of Uruguay and Argentina, against which complaints had been presented under Article 26 of the Constitution. In the case concerning Uruguay, dealt with in the 200th Report, the Committee expressed its concern about the new draft Act on occupational associations, and it had asked its Chairman to examine with representatives of the Uruguayan Government means of arriving at rapid and satisfactory solutions to the points at issue. In the case concerning Argentina, which was the subject of its 201st Report, the Committee noted some progress under the provisions of the new trade union legislation, while suggesting desirable amendments.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-NINTH REPORT

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) expressed the Employers' agreement with the Committee's conclusions and the general remarks of the previous speaker.

Mr. Isacsson (Government, Sweden) gathered from the Introduction to the report that 28 of the 53 cases in which the Committee had sought observations from governments had been adjourned. In many instances this was because governments had failed to supply the necessary information or observations, even following urgent appeals to do so. The Committee had been further hampered by the late receipt of information. Such failure on the part of governments to co-operate by providing full and timely information was highly regrettable, all the more so as some of the adjourned cases concerned extremely serious infringements of human rights and liberties. The need for such co-operation should therefore be stressed once again, since without it the measures introduced recently to speed up the Committee's work would be of very little help.

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) drew attention to paragraph 4 of the report listing cases relating to eight countries on which information or observations from governments was still awaited.

Only two days before the Governing Body had discussed a resolution unanimously adopted at the Third European Regional Conference which requested a speedy examination of complaints about the violation of freedom of association and trade union rights, but three European countries which had supported the resolution - Greece, Spain and the USSR - were quoted in paragraph 4 of the report as not fulfilling their obligations.

In view of the standing of those countries and the part they considered themselves entitled to play within the ILO, it was not too much to expect them to pay more than lip service to principles to which they had freely subscribed. It was to be hoped that this would be the last reminder they would need and that they would now respond promptly to the Committee's appeal.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed the Workers' concern over the number of cases, including some serious and long-standing ones, which had to be adjourned.

The case relating to Chile was particularly disturbing. Its adjournment was due simply to non-cooperation on the part of the Chilean Government, and the Workers' group insisted that the Committee should take up the matter at its next meeting. The information mentioned in paragraph 7 of the report, together with observations on the new complaints, should be sent to the Committee well in advance. After serious discussion in the Workers' group it had been suggested that it might be time to send a further high-level mission to Chile for on-the-spot investigations to press the views of the Governing Body upon the Chilean Government.
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The Workers' group was also concerned about the urgent appeals addressed to the Governments of Guatemala, Malaysia and Paraguay. Information that the Malaysian Government was planning to introduce more restrictive legislation in the trade union field was particularly disturbing.

As stated in paragraph 17 of the report, the Committee had not been kept informed of developments in the cases relating to Chad and Peru. The situation in Chad was a particularly serious one and a stronger wording of the Committee's request as recorded in paragraph 17 would have seemed more appropriate.

Mr. Timmer (Worker, Hungary), supporting Mr. Horris's statement, was greatly surprised that the case concerning Chile was being adjourned. The situation there had not changed in any way and the most serious violations were still occurring. It was most regrettable, and indeed unacceptable, that the case should be further adjourned.

Mr. Jiménez de Parga (Government, Spain) referred to Case No. 900 relating to Spain and reminded the Governing Body that that case involved trade union assets running to thousands of millions of pesetas, the rightful ownership of which was now the subject of lengthy and complex negotiations. The Committee had recommended a one-year time limit for completion of those negotiations, and that time limit would not expire until the following year. The employers' and workers' organisations taking part in the negotiations were gradually approaching solutions, and the Government, which had turned its back once and for all on the practices of the Franco régime, had no intention of imposing its views on them. It was not a matter of the Government refusing to provide information: it merely wished to give the two sides full scope for reaching an agreement within the agreed time span. Once the time limit expired, the Government would provide definitive information.

Case No. 874 had arisen out of the application of legislation which was a relic of the former régime and had just that week been abrogated as a result of the final adoption of the new Statute of the Worker. In its reply the Government had indicated that such action was on the verge of being taken by the Spanish Employers. That action was now an accomplished fact, and Mr. Verschueren and his Employer colleagues would no doubt be pleased to hear that the new text had received the massive support of the Spanish employers through the Spanish Confederation of Employers' Organisations, as well as of the workers through the Spanish General Workers' Union, affiliated to the ICFTU.

It was important to dispel any impression that Spain lacked freedom of association. Times had changed since the Spanish Government was among those most frequently brought to book in the Committee on Freedom of Association. Certain relics of inertia might remain, including the tendency of trade unions to turn automatically to the ILO to redress grievances, even fairly minor ones, but the fact remained that, whether or not Spain could justifiably claim to be one of the ten member States of chief industrial importance, it was surely one of the ten in which freedom of association was most highly respected.

Mr. Hairwaring (Government, Canada) explained that the Canadian case cited in paragraph 4 of the report involved a provincial government with which the Federal Government had to deal by correspondence. Despite delays which this inevitably caused, negotiations were progressing and a reply to the Committee could be expected in the near future.

Mr. Kostin (Government, USSR) considered it unnecessary, following the discussion on paragraph 4 of the report, to go into details about the case relating to the USSF because the facts about the persons on the list submitted to the Governing Body had already been explained by Mr. Pimenov and himself the previous year to the Governing Body.

There had been no possibility of submitting any further information at that point in response to the additional material sent to the USSR Government by the Committee, arising out of the further statement by the ICFTU and others, as that material had only been received in February.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 20, 27, 45, 63, 77, 97, 112, 137, 162, 173, 191, 209 and 226 of the report.

Mr. Fogarty (Government, Australia), referring to Case No. 902, pointed out that as regards one of the complaints — the Administrative and Clerical Officers' Association — none of its members had been in any way affected by the operation of the Act in question.
The original complaint had been considered by the Committee on Freedom of Association and the Governing Body in November 1978. Although it had been passed, the Act had not been brought into force until July 1979, in a serious national situation arising out of a dispute in the telecommunications sector. The Committee had in November 1978 clearly reaffirmed its long-held principle that freedom of association did not imply a right to strike by civil servants and that conciliation and arbitration procedures should be available to settle disputes involving government employees. As recognised in the current report, the Australian Government had made an unqualified statement to the Committee that there was nothing in the Act precluding recourse to conciliation and arbitration, and that aspect of the case had accordingly been cleared up.

The Committee had, however, considered two further matters raised subsequently by the Administrative and Clerical Officers' Association (ACOA (CPS)) and the Australian Telecommunications Employees' Association (ATEA). The latter union was not involved in the original complaint. The two matters at issue were the withdrawal of the check-off system by the authorities in respect of unions in the public sector, and certain amendments to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

On the second of these matters the complaint had been received in December 1979 and could not have reached the Australian authorities until mid-January 1980. As to the first, the Government in its December 1979 reply had promised to submit observations as soon as possible; however, in the meantime the ATEA complaint had supervened and the Government was examining both matters; it would send a prompt reply.

The speaker was troubled by the Committee's action in offering observations on the new complaints before it had received a reply from the Australian Government, and he intended to draw the Government's attention to this matter.

Mr. Hawke (Worker, Australia) observed that the Australian Government's version of the facts as recorded in paragraph 232 of the report reflected a fairly elastic use of language.

As to Mr. Fogarty's criticism of the procedure followed by the Committee, the latter was fully justified in expressing a judgement about the likely impact on industrial relations of the withdrawal of the check-off facility, which had been available to unions for a considerable period and was an integral part of their financing arrangements. Withdrawal of the facility was a small-minded and petty action very likely to have the consequences described by the Committee in paragraph 257 of the report, and it was quite rightly that the Committee, in paragraph 259(b), recommended bringing this to the Australian Government's attention.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 259, 282, 289, 304, 312 and 335.

TWO HUNDREDTH REPORT

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed the Workers' utmost concern about the case relating to Uruguay. At its previous session the Governing Body, noting the serious violations in that country of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, had insisted that the draft legislation on trade unions should be brought fully into line with those Conventions. The Committee's current report showed that the revised draft legislation contained no substantial changes or improvements. It was clear that the violation of freedom of association and trade union rights remained as flagrant as ever in Uruguay.

The Workers' group was indignant at the continued detention without trial of several trade unionists and vigorously condemned the Uruguayan Government's total disregard of the conclusions of the Governing Body. If the contacts mentioned in paragraph 35 of the report did not lead to progress, serious thought would have to be given to an investigation on the spot. With countries which systematically and flagrantly violated the principles of freedom of association, the ILO should send high-level delegations to examine complaints as requested at the 61st Session of the Conference.

Mr. Pimenov (Worker, USSR) supported Mr. Morris's statement, which reflected the unanimous views of the Workers' group.
He wished to bring to the Governing Body's attention fresh information based on reports from worker colleagues who had recently emigrated from Uruguay. The situation there gave cause for alarm. There seemed to be no end to the increasing repression and gross violation of trade union rights. Left-wing parties were prohibited from functioning and the right of workers to strike or press legitimate demands did not exist. In 1978 and 1979 some 4,800 workers had been dismissed from their jobs. Collective bargaining was not permitted, and moves were afoot to combine all workers in a government-controlled trade union movement. In the national elections to be held by November 1981 electors could only vote for specified candidates. There were currently 6,000 political detainees in Uruguay prisons and, in 7 years of military dictatorship, some 80,000 persons had been imprisoned or put into concentration camps. Moreover, 100,000 persons were prohibited from holding government appointments because of their political beliefs. Fifteen thousand were deprived of political rights and hundreds had disappeared. In the past 6 years about 650,000 Uruguayans had had to leave their country for political reasons. A policy of repression was obviously being applied against the most influential trade union, the National Congress, and, following its prohibition in 1973, trade union leaders had been arrested, many of whom he could name.

ILO protests about the arbitrary action of the Uruguayan Government against trade unions were met by demagogic statements from the authorities about the temporary character of their measures. The ILO should unequivocally condemn what was taking place in Uruguay.

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) expressed the Employers' support for the Committee's recommendations. The Employers, though they acknowledged that the Government of Uruguay had maintained continuous contact with the Committee, could still not regard the position as wholly satisfactory. They hoped that the Government of Uruguay would respond positively to the Committee's requests, particularly as regards the detention of certain trade unionists and the application of the new legislation.

Mr. Gonzalez Navarro (Worker, Venezuela) said that some of the most repressive governments in contemporary history were now in power in the southern triangle of Latin America. Freedom of association was an inalienable right, whose importance within the context of the New International Economic Order the Director-General had eloquently stressed in an address delivered recently in Venezuela, and one of the challenges of the 1980s would be to remedy the situation created by the policies of the governments of the four countries concerned. Persecution of trade union leaders and their families were commonplace in those countries and legislation had been promulgated to repress trade union activity. That had been happening for a number of years already, and Venezuela was receiving a constant flow of refugees from the dictatorships that held sway in those countries.

When a similar situation had existed in the past in Venezuela the violations had been denounced at the ILO, and a committee dispatched in 1954 to investigate maltreatment of trade unionists had achieved remarkable results, including the release of hundreds of trade unionists and political prisoners. A similar high-level committee should be sent now, comprising representatives of the Governing Body groups and a Deputy Director-General, to visit the four countries of the southern triangle and to encourage the adoption of human rights policies as well as to secure the release of imprisoned trade unionists.

Mr. Zenker (Government, Switzerland) reminded the Governing Body that in the discussion on the Medium-Term Plan, 1982-87, special stress had been placed on the importance of ILO activities to safeguard human rights and freedom of association in all member States. The Swiss Government, firmly attached to the tripartite system and to the supervisory procedures of the ILO, deeply appreciated the work done by the Committee on Freedom of Association and the supporting Office staff.

The proper functioning of supervisory procedures and tripartism, however, depended on good faith, active co-operation and respect for fundamental principles of the ILO, and it was deplorable that too often obligations which had been freely entered into were not scrupulously and sincerely fulfilled, particularly so in the case of freedom of association.

Given the cardinal importance of those procedures, it was vital that all should take them seriously and that all countries where the Committee had found unsatisfactory and unacceptable situations to exist should follow its recommendations, whether they concerned direct, practical steps in furtherance of trade union rights or legislative action towards that end.
Mr. Falchetti Migone (Government, Uruguay) pointed out that the case relating to Uruguay had been before the Governing Body at successive sessions in recent years and that each time he had been able to report progress.

The Uruguayan Government's promise to transmit the draft law on occupational associations to Parliament before 15 December 1979 had now been fulfilled, and the Council of State currently had the Bill under consideration. If progress had at times been slow it was because of the complexity of the problem and the seriousness of the local situation, as well as the Government's serious concern that the Act eventually promulgated should stand some chance of being effectively implemented.

Due account had been taken of ILO suggestions and of those of the representative employers' and workers' organisations of Uruguay. In particular, the rules concerning the formation of federations and confederations and those relating to political activities of trade unions were based on the suggestions of the Committee on Freedoms of Association. Indeed, the Government had accorded priority consideration to the ILO's suggestions, and even if it had not accepted all of them it did not believe that the Bill in its present form transgressed the provisions of Convention No. 87.

Evidently the Committee held a different view, and admittedly there might be room for varying interpretations of some of the provisions of the Bill. The speaker would bring the Committee's report to the attention of his Government in the hope of settling such differences of interpretation informally, without any need for resort to the constitutional machinery.

Uruguay was overcoming a state of war imposed on it by international terrorism, and the Government, while determined to regulate the activities of occupational associations by adopting legislation which, in line with Convention No. 87, would guarantee the rights of employers and workers, was determined to avoid the excesses of previous years which had brought Uruguay to the point of collapse.

In paying tribute to the technical assistance of the Committee and the support of ILO services, the speaker reaffirmed Uruguay's willingness to discuss matters openly and to co-operate with the Organisation. The Committee's wise, tactful and constructive approach, together with his country's firm intention of settling its trade union problems, augured well for a settlement of the matter.

Mr. Timmer (Worker, Hungary) noted with deep concern that the situation in Uruguay had not improved. Restrictive legislation, persecution of trade unions and the imprisonment of trade union leaders in inhumane conditions were common features of everyday life. Despite repeated promises the Uruguayan Government had done nothing and the draft law on occupational associations, in particular, would scarcely improve the situation.

The Governing Body had therefore reached the stage where energetic action was needed to compel the Government to meet its obligations. For these reasons he fully supported the statement of Mr. Morris made on behalf of the Workers' group.

Mr. Ventejol (Government, France) supported the views expressed by Mr. Morris and Mr. Zenger. The gravity of the situation in Uruguay was recognised by all. What was at issue was freedom of association as well as the application of correct judicial procedures — procedures which should not in any case interfere with trade union activities and which, in the case of Uruguay, seemed extremely cumbersome.

Mr. Macha (Worker, Tanzania) urged applying maximum pressure to the Government of Uruguay to ensure full trade union liberties for the workers of that country. A strong delegation from the ILO should be sent to Uruguay to exert the necessary pressure.

Mr. Jiménez de Parra (Government, Spain) expressed his Government's deep concern about violations of freedom of association and indeed of human rights in general.

The case of Uruguay was especially disturbing, and yet Uruguay was only one of the countries in the southern part of Latin America where, despite promises and gestures of goodwill from the governments concerned, fundamental freedoms and democracy were still being denied. Chile, of course, was another, and for years the ILO had been trying to secure some progress towards freedom in that country. The Spanish Government therefore wholeheartedly endorsed the appeals addressed to the ILO by Mr. Morris and Mr. González Navarro to prevail on the governments of the countries in question to show greater respect for basic human rights.
The Spanish Government was distressed to see that complaints before the Committee most commonly related to countries in Latin America, a region about which Spain cared deeply owing to historical, cultural and other ties. Yet there were countries in other parts of the world where there was also cause for deep concern even though cases involving those countries rarely came before the Committee on Freedom of Association. An example was Iran in the days of the Shah and many others could be cited. It was therefore perhaps unfair to pick solely on Latin American countries.

Countries might in fact be divided into three categories. First, there were those - a tiny minority - which fully respected freedom of association; secondly, there were those where, though freedom of association was not always respected, there did exist means of redress; and thirdly, there were those - and there were very many - where there was neither freedom of association nor any means of redress.

In the circumstances, it might be appropriate for the Governing Body to consider acting proprio motu in cases where no formal complaint could be lodged, but where the denial of trade union freedoms was a matter of notoriety.

The Director-General observed that the Committee had, as was stated in paragraph 35 of its report, empowered its chairman to examine with the representatives of the Government of Uruguay on the Governing Body the best way of settling the questions raised, and that the Chairman had done so the very next day. That afforded further proof of the Committee’s determination to leave no means untried in overcoming the problems which might arise in any country over the application of Convention No. 87.

As Mr. Jiménez de Parga had just said, the ILO must strive harder than ever to ensure full freedom of association throughout the world. Freedom of association, and indeed all freedom, was indivisible, and the ILO had a solemn and abiding duty to ensure respect for its constitutional principles and so also to help member States in overcoming any practical difficulties.

The task was not an easy one, but the ILO would bend all efforts to meet the challenge, and would employ all the means at its disposal. There was, for one thing, the machinery for supervising the application of standards, comprising the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, which was to meet shortly, and the competent Conference committee. Moreover, the resolution on freedom of association adopted by the Third European Regional Conference set out principles and guidelines on the subject which would prove invaluable, not just to Europe, but to the world at large.

Lastly, Mr. Jiménez de Parga had suggested that the ILO was perhaps unduly preoccupied with violations of freedom of association in Latin America. He might rest assured that there were in fact no double standards. The ILO could scarcely be accused of being selective since it merely took up the complaints which were referred to it. If the ILO seemed to spend more time discussing cases in Latin America than cases in other regions, it was simply because there were more complaints relating to Latin American countries.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 36 of the report.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIRST REPORT

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed the Workers’ serious concern about the trade union situation in Argentina. The new trade union legislation was not at all in conformity with Convention No. 87, and it was deplorable that the Government had failed to co-operate by meeting the Committee’s request that it should supply the text of the draft legislation before adoption. The amendments to the legislation should be made as a matter of urgency to bring it fully into line with the Conventions on freedom of association.

The Workers had been indignant to hear of the dissolution of the General Confederation of Labour (CGT) and they trusted that new information on the matter of the funds of trade unions in Argentina would be fully examined by the Committee at its next meeting, since the measures proposed by the Government threatened to deprive the trade unions of their financial assets.

One of the most tragic aspects of the case was the arrest and disappearance of many trade unionists, and the Workers strongly urged the Government of Argentina to
provide full information about their fate and put an end to such persecution. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights was setting up special machinery — or so the Workers had been informed — to deal with the question of "disappearances". In taking that decision specific reference had been made to Argentina, and it would be advisable for the ILO to exchange information and co-operate with the Commission on the matter. In the Workers' view, moreover, the case of Argentina was so serious, and so little progress had been made over the years, that, here again, it would be worth sending a high-level ILO mission to the country.

Lastly, the suggestion that the Committee gave excessive attention to Latin America did not bear scrutiny. As anyone who looked at the Committee's reports could see, it dealt with cases relating to countries all over the world, not just to one region. Yet there was no denying that the cases which the Governing Body was now discussing were the most intractable and had been before the Committee for many years. The case of Argentina, for example, dated back four-and-a-half years, and the cases of Chile and Uruguay even longer.

The Workers would not tolerate double standards: they would come out in defence of freedom of association, whenever and wherever it was being denied. But it was a sad fact that in the southern part of Latin America human and trade union rights were being most flagrantly disregarded, and the only remedy was to exert on the governments concerned the strongest pressure the ILO could mount.

Mr. Verschueren (Employer, Belgium) expressed the Employers' support for the Committee's conclusions and recommendations.

There was cause for both disappointment and hope in the report. On the one hand, the adoption of new legislation was welcome; on the other, it was a pity that it had not been submitted to the Committee before adoption. At all events the Employers earnestly hoped that the way in which that legislation was applied would respect the principles embodied in Convention No. 87 and that the regulations which were yet to be adopted under the legislation would take account of the Committee's recommendations.

The Employers could certainly support the Workers' proposal for sending a high-level mission to Latin America since it would serve the objectives which the ILO was pursuing in that region.

Mr. Naldo (Government, Philippines) suggested that the Committee's reports should mention all the complainants by name rather than use such vague and sometimes misleading terms as "various other trade union organisations" or "a number of delegates".

The Director-General observed that, while the Committee would certainly consider that suggestion, such terms were used merely for the sake of brevity and the names of the complainant organisations were usually given in full, at least at the beginning of each report. In the case of Argentina, for example, the complainant organisations were named at the beginning of Part II of the 201st Report.

Mr. Martinez (Government, Argentina) believed that the trade union situation in each country must not be judged out of the context of actual conditions prevailing there, and that it was therefore quite wrong to lump countries together under some vague geographical rubric and level arbitrary and indiscriminate charges against Argentina simply because it was one of them.

The Committee's conclusions in the case relating to Argentina were commendably moderate in tone. Some of its remarks, however — for example those in paragraphs 36, 40, 43, 47, 48, 57, 59 and 61 of the report — were directed, not at any actual discrepancies between the new trade union legislation — Act No. 21205 — and Convention No. 87, but merely at difficulties which might in practice arise in respecting that instrument assuming that the Act were applied in a particular way.

There was ample evidence of the Argentine Government's liberal trade union policy and of its determination to restore the trade union situation to normal. In September 1979 and January 1980, for example, it had adopted measures authorising wage increases in individual undertakings. In other words, there was to be cooperation, discussion and wages better matched to productivity, and this constituted further progress towards full exercise of the right to conclude collective agreements. Moreover, in paragraph 27 of its report the Committee had indeed acknowledged that under the new legislation workers enjoyed the right to bargain collectively through their associations.
As the Government had often pointed out, the partial restrictions at present set on certain trade union activities had been made necessary by a grave economic, social and political crisis and were only temporary; as the state of affairs in the country improved those restrictions would be steadily eased and the full exercise of trade union rights would be safeguarded. The Government had indeed moved rapidly in that direction - more rapidly perhaps than the Committee had expected: it was in May 1979 that the Committee and the Governing Body had called for new legislation in conformity with ILO standards, and by November the legislation had already been adopted.

Whatever the Committee might think of that legislation, it was at least in force and was therefore surely preferable to a mere bill. By 29 February 1980 1,982 trade unions had applied for registration in accordance with section 9 of the Act, whereas only 1,118 associations had been registered as trade unions under the old legislation - a sure sign of the strong trend towards democracy in the trade union movement.

All this suggested that there were no grounds for imputing to the Government the intention of applying the new legislation in such a way as to restrict trade union activities. It had disclaimed time and again any desire to fragment or otherwise weaken the trade union movement and affirmed its belief in the need for strong and democratic trade unions. No one who knew how things really stood in Argentina could contend that the new legislation afforded any opportunity for undermining the movement. In fact the aim was to strengthen its democratic structure.

The former legislation had allowed the untrammelled growth of trade union power and its excessive concentration in a largely unrepresentative confederation which had been put to party political ends, engaged in a wide range of activities with no bearing on employment and affecting all workers, whether unionised or not, and had gravely disruptive effects on the country. That "hypertrophy" of power had come from the compulsory transfer of vast trade union assets to the confederation and from a centralisation of decision-making authority gravely harmful to the affiliated unions, and the ILO's supervisory bodies had been rightly critical.

The aim of the new legislation was to strengthen the autonomy of the basic trade unions, but at the same time both prevent their proliferation and allow them to form federations and confederations, the aim being to have a trade union system which not only performed its proper functions on behalf of the workers and represented sectional interests but also formed part of the democratic structure of the nation.

It was true, as the Committee had observed, that the new legislation did not cover trade union federations, but there was nothing sinister about that; nor could it be construed as a breach of Convention No. 87. Federations would be free, in accordance with the guarantees embodied in the national Constitution, to acquire legal personality and to register like any other trade union association; there was nothing in the new Act which prohibited the existence of such federations, and there was no need to adopt special rules about them. Anyone familiar with conditions in Argentina could reassure the Committee that trade unions wishing to join a federation or confederation would in no way be prevented by the authorities from doing so. The workers' movement was a vital force of the nation and did not depend for its strength on the provisions of any legislation.

As for the General Confederation of Labour (CGT), there seemed to be some misunderstanding of the position, to judge at any rate from the further allegations that had recently been made by an international trade union organisation - oddly enough, the same one which in 1977 had sent a fact-finding delegation to Argentina and had at the time protested that it had no intention of meddling in the country's domestic affairs or of defending the CGT, which it had described as a corrupt Peronist institution.

The CGT had, it was true, been dissolved under an Act passed by Congress. But the constitutionality of the Act had been challenged by a number of trade unionists, the case was at present before the Supreme Court, and outside intervention would serve no purpose whatever. The best way to settle the problem would be, not to try to apply pressure, but to let the Government carry on its dialogue with the trade union movement.

In any event, there was no question of disposing of the CGT's assets otherwise than as specified in the Act or of diverting them for political ends which had no bearing on the legitimate interests of the trade union movement.
Lastly, the Government of Argentina wished to place on record its deep concern about the fate of the missing trade unionists. Their disappearance had, of course, nothing whatever to do with their trade union activities, but, as the Committee had stated in paragraph 16 of its report, the Government was diligently carrying out investigations.

Mr. Morris had suggested that the resolution recently adopted by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights on the subject of missing persons singled out Argentina for special mention. As the representative of his Government on the Commission, of which Argentina was a member, the speaker could personally certify that the resolution was couched in general terms and made no specific reference to cases of disappearance in Argentina.

Mr. Perez Castillo (Government, Venezuela), endorsing the remarks made by Mr. Ventejol and Mr. Jiménez de Parga, expressed concern about the situation in Argentina and supported the Workers' proposal for sending a high-level mission—consisting, as Mr. González Navarro had suggested, of representatives of the Governing Body groups and a Deputy Director-General—to the southern triangle of Latin America.

Mrs. Ferrero (Government, Venezuela) also expressed concern about the cases still under consideration in the Committee. Although, thanks largely to the Committee's positive and realistic approach, welcome progress had been made in some countries towards fuller freedom of association, violations were still common in many countries, and that was quite unacceptable.

There were no grounds for supposing that the Committee was unduly preoccupied with one region of the world. Although far too many complaints did relate to Latin American countries, the list of cases before the Committee showed that freedom of association was being denied in other parts of the world too.

Mr. Emami (Government, Iran), referring to the remarks made by Mr. Jiménez de Parga about Iran, stated that for about a year Iran had been in a state of revolution and had a revolutionary Government which was pursuing specifically Iranian and Islamic objectives in all spheres.

The new Constitution fully guaranteed trade union rights, and for several months trade unions and workers' councils, though still at the initial and experimental stage, had been functioning in total freedom. Because of the special conditions prevailing in the country the workers' councils could not be assimilated to trade unions in the traditional sense.

Mr. Jiménez de Parga (Government, Spain) explained that he had of course been referring to the repression practised by the former regime. It was gratifying to hear of the revolutionary Government's efforts to build a new order based on freedom.

Mr. Baldassini (Worker, Argentina) endorsed what Mr. Morris had said about the case relating to Argentina and supported the appeals addressed to the ILO by the Employers and certain Government members to do its utmost to ensure respect for freedom of association and indeed all human rights throughout the world.

For four years the trade union movement in Argentina had been striving to secure release from the restrictions set on its legitimate activities and an end to such repressive practices as the arrest and detention of its leaders and other attempts by the Government to undermine it, weaken its bargaining power and dangerously upset the social equilibrium of the nation.

Now new trade union legislation had been enacted which, though the Government maintained that the purpose was to restore the trade union situation to normal, was in fact a form of state interference and constituted a further threat to the freedom and independence of the trade union movement. This might be illustrated by citing only a few of its provisions.

First of all, contrary to the requirement of Convention No. 87 that trade unions should be free to draw up their own rules, it gave the Ministry of Labour sole and discretionary authority to approve such rules. Moreover, if those rules did not satisfy the Ministry's inflexible requirements, the Ministry was authorised, under section 69 of Act No. 22105, to notify its comments to the trade union concerned, which had to amend its rules accordingly within 30 days. In other words, trade unions had no right to draw up their own rules independently, but must comply with the Ministry's dictates.
Another matter of deep concern to the working people of Argentina was the dissolution, in its fiftieth anniversary year, of the General Confederation of Labour and the appropriation of its assets for such purposes as the Government might determine. That was tantamount to confiscation and was a savage blow to the trade union movement which the workers simply could not tolerate, and they had referred the matter to the courts in the hope of securing an impartial judgement.

It had been said during the present debate that the trade unions in Argentina had grown too powerful because the payment of dues by all workers had been compulsory. That system had apparently been offensive to the Government, and the new legislation did away with it in yet another attempt to undermine the trade union movement.

Again, under the new legislation any worker, whether a trade union member or not, was entitled to vote in trade union elections. As a result it was now possible to rig such elections by transferring non-unionised labour from one undertaking to another just before they took place.

Thus not only was the military regime's new legislation a grave breach of Convention No. 87, as the Committee's report made clear, but it was also morally reprehensible in that it would cause grievous harm to the workers' cause and to the welfare of the nation at large.

It was therefore of vital importance for the Governing Body to do its utmost to get the case settled satisfactorily. It would be tragic if nothing were done to put an end to the many breaches of freedom of association which the Committee had described in such specific detail in its report. For sixty years the workers of Argentina had ardently believed in the ILO and in its ability to defend their rights and freedoms, and if it failed to come to their rescue now their faith in it would be seriously impaired.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) observed, in reply to what Mr. Martinez had said about the resolution on missing persons adopted by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, that, although the text was couched in general terms, the Commission had had the case of Argentina very much in mind. Mr. Martinez would surely not deny that many people, including trade unionists, had disappeared in Argentina and that that was especially disturbing in a country which had ratified Convention No. 87. The matter was therefore one of concern not only to the national authorities but also, in view of the country's obligations under that international instrument, to the ILO as well.

Mr. Martinez (Government, Argentina) wished to make it quite clear that the resolution mentioned by Mr. Morris did not contain a single reference to Argentina.

If any proof were needed of the existence of democracy and freedom in Argentina, it lay in the remarkable statement just made by Mr. Baldassini. It was as a representative of the General Confederation of Labour that Mr. Baldassini had been elected to the Workers' group, and he had every right - and the Government of Argentina fully respected it - to express his views without let or hindrance in the Governing Body.

Some quite mistaken remarks had been made about the General Confederation of Labour, but, as he had said earlier, the matter was in the hands of the Supreme Court, and in time, once judgement had been given, the truth would become clear. For the time being, all that need be said was that there had been no confiscation of the Confederation's assets, confiscation of property being strictly forbidden under the national Constitution.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 67 of the report.

The sitting closed at 1.10 p.m.
SIXTH SITTING  
(Thursday, 6 March 1980, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 4.45 p.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Pontsop.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee

First Report

Miss Silva y Silva (Government, Peru) endorsed the statement of the representative of the Government of Mexico recorded in paragraph 8 of the report: it was discriminatory to refer to political events in connection with Latin America only.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany), referring to paragraph 9 of the report, said that he had in the meantime received an answer to his question from Mr. Tamburi, Chief of the Social Security Department.

Mr. Isaçsson (Government, Sweden) noted that in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the report a brief reference was made to the situation of the United Nations Development Programme Funds and Trust Funds available to the ILO: that was a major aspect of ILO technical co-operation which would more appropriately be dealt with by the Committee on Operational Programmes. Similarly, the International Organisations Committee was called upon to discuss matters with a close bearing on ILO technical co-operation, like the New International Economic Order or the follow-up to the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development.

Such divided responsibility was not conducive to efficiency and was particularly unfortunate in view of the steady increase in technical co-operation. Sweden's interest in the matter was understandable since in 1979 it had contributed nearly $9 million for technical co-operation activities, representing almost half of the amounts spent by the ILO on trust fund and multilateral programmes.

The speaker accordingly urged, repeating a proposal he had already made at the November session, that all such questions should be entrusted comprehensively to a single committee, preferably the Committee on Operational Programmes, whose agenda might be reframed accordingly.

The Director-General, while agreeing that Mr. Isaçsson's point was well taken, observed that the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee had to be informed of the amount and source of the funds available for technical co-operation programmes. That was why information on those programmes was submitted to it, but it was essentially financial information.

There was, nevertheless, room for discussion as to what would be the best system for consideration by the Governing Body and its committees of ILO technical co-operation activities. There had recently been a spectacular increase in those activities, despite the Organisation's difficulties with its regular budget, and that had given rise to a whole series of problems which needed solving in the best possible way.

The question was not new, but was possibly more urgent now than it had ever been, and if on this occasion certain aspects of technical co-operation activities had been dealt with by the International Organisations Committee it was because the Committee on Operational Programmes had not met during the session.

Perhaps, therefore, it might be desirable to revert to the practice of ten years before whereby the Committee on Operational Programmes met twice a year, in

---

1 See also seventh and eighth sittings.

---
February and November. That practice had been abandoned to lighten the Governing Body's sessions, but it might well be preferable to the alternative of referring questions concerning operational activities to the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, which was already overburdened.

The answer to the problem thus seemed to lie with the Committee on Operational Programmes, which would have to be provided with all the necessary information and given sufficient time to carry out its duties. Proposals to that end might be put to the Governing Body at a forthcoming session.

Mr. Isacsson (Government, Sweden) thanked the Director-General for his explanations and said that his suggestions would be studied with great interest.

Mr. Tudor (Government, Romania) wished to know whether the amendment proposed to the Rules for the payment of travel expenses of members of the Governing Body and of certain committees would increase the number of beneficiaries and what the financial consequences of that amendment would be for the Organisation.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Denby, Treasurer and Financial Comptroller) replied that the object in view was to clarify the Rules and make them marginally more generous in one or two cases, but that the financial consequences for the Organisation were so small as to be negligible.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 4, 18, 23, 25, 27, 30 and 37 of the report.

Second Report

Personnel questions

Mr. Ajai (Government, Nigeria), while supporting the recommendations in the report, drew attention to his statement recorded in paragraph 18. In the name of the ILO's cherished principle of universality, he urged that action should be taken to redress the geographical imbalance in the composition of ILO staff at all levels.

Mr. Neagu (Government, German Democratic Republic), as the representative of a country of which there were no nationals on the ILO staff, supported the ideas expressed in paragraph 23 of the report. Principles should be laid down for determining the composition and structure of the staff. Such principles already existed in the United Nations and in other specialised agencies, like the WHO, which had established a system of minimum and maximum quotas for each nationality.

Those principles should be studied to determine their applicability to the ILO. Qualifications was obviously one of them, but the principle of fair geographical distribution was equally important. It should be applied objectively and extended to the top management level.

Mr. Ruhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking for the Workers, drew attention to paragraph 15 of the report, which reflected their point of view. While an official's qualifications were of course the most important factor for recruitment, the geographical distribution of staff within the Office was admittedly far from adequate.

Staff distribution by sex was even less so. There was in that respect a striking lack of balance, mainly among the highest grades: there were 14 D.2 staff members, only one of whom was a woman; at the D.1 level, only one out of 40 officials was a woman. That was clearly incompatible with the principle of equality between the sexes recognised by the ILO. Governments naturally had their share of responsibility in the situation, to the extent that they put forward nominations for filling those posts. They should be asked to nominate more women candidates.

Mr. Jiménez de Parga (Government, Spain) did not wish to criticise the ILO staff, which he found excellent, but would like wider recruitment opportunities for countries, like Spain, whose representation was not commensurate with the part they played within the Organisation, if only in terms of contributions.
Paragraph 19 of the report contained the figures quoted by the representative of the Government of Spain to show the marked imbalances within the ILO staff. Qualifications were no doubt the most important factor in recruiting new personnel, as the Workers' spokesman had just pointed out, but the fact remained that certain countries at present were more generously represented than others. The Organisation should take that into account in future when recruiting or promoting staff, so as to improve geographical distribution between the various countries and regions of the world.

Mr. de Icaza (Government, Mexico), like the previous speaker, had no wish to question the competence and technical qualifications of the ILO staff, which was excellent and known to be among the best within the United Nations system.

He was surprised, however, to see that no effort had been made in 1979 to remedy an age structure which gave cause for legitimate concern regarding the future. As paragraph 25 of the report indicated, out of 38 Professional category officials recruited in 1979 only 11 were under 35 years of age.

Moreover, out of those 38 officials 16 only came from developing countries, as compared with 22 from advanced nations, and only 6 of them were women as compared with 32 men. Besides, certain regions were still under-represented in comparison with the others, and only one of the 38 officials came from Latin America.

Efforts had admittedly been made to correct the situation, but they were still inadequate. They should be pressed further, especially in the developing countries, where the ILO could find highly skilled personnel with an excellent knowledge of problems in the developing regions and who would be of great assistance in carrying out its priority programmes.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) joined with other speakers in pressing for better geographical distribution, which meant that every member State should be duly represented on the staff.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) noted that for the first time in several years the Director-General would now have an opportunity to carry out a real personnel policy, both because of a foreseeable improvement in the Organisation's finances and because of the impending retirement of a number of officials who would have to be replaced in coming months and years.

It would be a long-term operation, which would require planning and would have to be implemented gradually. The Governing Body had more or less agreed on a number of objectives which related to the skills and competence required of officials, internal promotions, and distribution by geographical area and sex. The operation itself was henceforth the Director-General's responsibility, and the Governing Body should leave it up to him.

Mr. Tomasevic (Government, Yugoslavia) was not satisfied with the composition and structure of the staff, either as regards headquarters staff or experts on technical co-operation projects.

He was well aware that recruitment was linked to the availability of funds, but he hoped nevertheless that present shortcomings would soon be corrected in accordance with the objectives laid down in the relevant section of the report.

The Director-General fully concurred with most of the statements just made. Proper geographical distribution, a satisfactory proportion of men and women and a balanced age structure were highly desirable objectives. Every effort should be made to achieve them now that - as Mr. Oechslin had just pointed out - the situation of the ILO was perhaps more encouraging than it had been in recent years, when the Office had known a particularly critical period, with a dramatic drop in resources due to the combined effect of the loss of the United States contribution and the fluctuating value of the dollar, and it had been necessary to abolish some 250 posts.

The concern expressed by Mr. de Icaza in particular was justified and it was indeed unfortunate that, of 38 staff members appointed in 1979, the Office had only been able to recruit one official from Latin America. That being said, and judging by the number of recruits over the past year, the situation had not been as bad as it might seem. Six women had been recruited, and that did, after all, represent an improvement. The explanation for the unsatisfactory distribution by age of the
new staff was that the enormous workload during the past year had made it necessary to look for highly skilled and experienced candidates, and that was why only 11 officials under the age of 35 had been appointed. As far as geographical distribution was concerned, there had been a fairly continuous turnover in recent years as regards staff from certain industrialised countries, and particularly from one region of Europe; the figures were thus artificially swollen by the need for recruiting in that part of Europe replacements for those who had chosen to return to their home countries or had been invited to do so by their governments.

Serious efforts would of course have to be made to improve geographical distribution - there were 45 member States which at present were not represented at all on the staff - as well as to recruit more young people and increase the number of women officials.

Apart from those three objectives there was a fourth, which was paramount: recruitment of staff of outstanding quality, and Hr. de Icaza had been right in pointing out that no member State was incapable of providing officials of a high calibre. No effort should be spared to meet that objective because in an organisation like the ILO, which was after all quite small considering the number of its Professional category officials (700 in Geneva), each one of those officials had an extremely important part to play.

As to the financial implications of the return of the United States, which had been mentioned, it should be made clear that the United States contribution would be used first of all to relieve the financial burden on other member States, and it should not be assumed that the situation would suddenly become so prosperous as to enable recruitment to be resumed immediately on a large scale. The truth of the matter was that prospects were only a little more encouraging, but the situation would no doubt improve gradually in the next four years.

A certain number of posts would be filled as from 1980 and efforts would be made to achieve the four objectives just mentioned when recruiting new staff, but member States would have to help the Office to find suitable candidates. In view of the increasing complexity of the questions dealt with by the ILO, it was essential to recruit high-quality staff and the process should be one of constant co-operation between member States and the Director-General.

Mr. Tudor (Government, Romania) also considered it unlikely that the difficulties of the Organisation could be solved overnight and fully concurred with the Director-General's very realistic point of view.

For a better and more speedy solution of those difficulties, a high level of organisation and discipline were essential. The Director-General had given an indication of what future recruitment conditions and criteria might be; these might be usefully embodied in a draft text on the basis of which the Governing Body would decide on the new personnel policy.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) was under no illusions as to the likely effect of the return of the United States on the Organisation's finances. As the ILO had begun the year 1980 with a deficit of $21.1 million the first thing to do was to improve its cash flow position, and the United States contribution should be used both carefully and judiciously.

Mr. Kühr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) confirmed his statement recorded in paragraph 42 of the report. The Workers believed that, in his negotiations on pensions questions, the Director-General should make it clear that it was open to the ILO either to set up a complementary pension scheme or, better yet, to set up a fund of its own.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 36, 38, 47, 49, 53 and 57 of the report.
THIRTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Allocations Committee

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 11 of the report. The sitting closed at 5.55 p.m.
SEVENTH SITTING
(Friday, 7 March 1980, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.20 a.m., under the chairmanship of Mr. Donsop.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

Report on the Turin Centre

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed the Employers' general support for the recommendations in paragraph 75 of the report. In their view the Turin Centre was facing both a short- and a medium-term problem.

Part of the answer to the short-term problem lay in paragraph 75(a), (b) and (c), which provided, first, for clearing the deficit and settling the debts incurred by the Centre and, secondly, for financing terminal payments for the staff. A general consensus seemed to have been reached on those various points; but it should not be forgotten that in the short term other problems, especially staff and management problems, had to be faced, and they would have to be settled despite all the difficulties they entailed. The new Director had already tackled them very courageously, and the Employers hoped that they would be kept informed of developments. They pledged their support to the Director in such steps as he might have to take.

The medium-term problem was far more important, but it should be put in perspective. The basic question was not whether or not the Centre should be closed down and whether or not it should receive financial assistance. The real starting point in any consideration of the matter was the premise that ILO basic and advanced training activities were of paramount importance, and hence that the Organisation should increase its efforts in that area.

The next question was what were the most suitable means for carrying out those activities. There were a number of options, which included training at the local or regional level, or training in Turin or in other centres. The Turin Centre was only one of those options and its position in the world of training had to be defined. Both the needs and the facilities available for meeting them had to be assessed. For that purpose the Employers had suggested that member States should be asked to specify their advanced training needs and that their replies should be looked at in relation to the facilities available, so as to determine whether priority should be given to Turin or to other means of training. That was the kind of information the Governing Body would need before deciding whether to grant financial assistance to the Centre.

The third stage would be to draw fully objective consequences from such an inquiry. The mere fact that the Centre corresponded to a lofty ideal was not enough to justify its existence; there had also to be evidence that it met a specific need and that its cost was not excessive.

If it was found that the Turin Centre was not the most appropriate type of advanced training facility the consequences would have to be drawn, unpleasant though they might be. If, conversely, Turin was judged to occupy a unique position among all facilities available to the Organisation the consequences would have to be drawn there too, and a way would have to be found, either through regular budget financing or through additional government contributions, for placing the Centre on a sound financial footing.

1 See also sixth and eighth sittings.
In brief, it had to be shown first that the Centre met a real need and, next, a long-term decision would have to be taken. Nothing could be worse than making no decision at all, raising questions year after year about the Centre's usefulness, facing a deficit each year without having any real idea of how to meet it, and continuing to rely on stopgap solutions which would not bring the final answer any closer. The proposals the Director-General was to submit should give the Governing Body a clear picture of the situation and enable it to act accordingly.

Mr. Ruhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) confirmed the workers' position as set out in the Committee's report.

Generally speaking, the workers regarded the Turin Centre as a useful part of the training programme, but only a part of it, which could not replace any of the others and could on no account be a substitute for regional activities.

 Provision should naturally be made for the financial independence of the Centre, which had to remain entirely free to carry out its programme as it saw fit. Fixed costs would therefore have to be covered by fixed income and the workers were prepared to take part in discussions in which the possibility of an ILO regular budget contribution might be considered.

The workers endorsed the proposals in paragraph 75 (a), (b) and (c) of the report, which were reasonable and consistent with the ILO's responsibility for the Centre. That responsibility was not merely a legal one - although a legal liability undoubtedly existed and had been clearly defined in the appendix to the report submitted to the Committee - but also a moral one, and that aspect alone entailed financial consequences.

The workers looked forward to the new proposals the Director-General would submit in November or in February the following year.

Mr. Ventejoil (Government, France) approved the temporary measures proposed, as they were needed to ensure the Centre's survival during the next two years. In the longer term, however, the main objectives should be to consolidate the Centre and discussions to that end should be pursued actively.

In the Turin Centre's favour was the obvious need throughout the world for the services it provided, since well-trained workers were an invaluable asset. The Centre's activities should not, however, duplicate but supplement those of other public or private bodies. That meant that the Centre should concentrate on training instructors while, at the level of the various countries, there should be a precise assessment of the needs and the best way of meeting them.

At present two major requirements had to be faced. The first was to increase the demand for the Centre's services, and in that connection the speaker had asked the European Economic Community for an estimate of further needs that could be met, at least in part, by the Centre. The second requirement was to reduce the fixed costs, and since Italy ought not to be left to carry the full burden of financial assistance to the Centre, the speaker intended to urge his country to adopt a positive attitude in that regard, either at the national level or through the European institutions.

Over and above measures to enable the Centre to carry on in the immediate future, it would be most desirable to introduce at last such basic changes in its operation and objectives as would ensure its continued existence in the longer term.

Mr. Kebleh (Government, Sierra Leone) stressed the importance and usefulness of the Turin Centre in providing the developing countries with training facilities to help build up the skilled labour force they urgently needed for carrying out their development plans and programmes, and in rendering other services such as research, documentation and co-ordination with the various United Nations specialized agencies.

The Turin Centre should be not only protected but considerably strengthened and placed on a sound financial and managerial footing. Since the ILO had set it up, it had an obligation to help it in the same way as it helped other institutions of the same kind, through the grant of an annual subsidy out of its regular budget. Pending a decision on the subject, Sierra Leone fully supported the recommendations at the end of the Committee's report.
Mr. Majumdar (Government, Bangladesh) confirmed his Government's position as recorded in paragraphs 28 and 61 of the report.

To cope with the Centre's immediate difficulties it was right and proper that the ILO should come to its aid along with other organisations, and no effort should be spared to keep it alive. It should not, however, become a department of the ILO and thereby a permanent burden on the Organisation's regular budget. It should remain, as originally decided by the Governing Body, an independent entity, with a truly international character.

Nor should any possible alternatives be overlooked, including the setting up of regional centres and the transfer to those centres of certain programmes currently being carried out in Turin at too high a cost.

The Centre should keep an extremely strict check on its budget and programmes. That purpose, however, would be defeated if it were to be purely and simply absorbed by the ILO, since that would ensure that its deficit would be covered in any case, and remove any incentives for it to put its house in order.

Mr. Esagi (Government, Iran) considered that there was too much discussion of the Centre's management and budget and not enough of its actual programmes. He wished to make five points.

First, the Turin Centre was potentially useful but its management methods as well as its programmes and objectives should be reviewed.

Secondly, it could not rely solely on voluntary contributions if it was to continue its activities under satisfactory conditions; it needed regular and assured income.

Thirdly, the Centre's programmes should be geared to the specific needs of each member State as determined in consultation with the various countries, with due regard to ongoing national programmes.

Fourthly, the contents and modalities of its technical programmes should be announced in advance for the benefit of countries interested in taking part. The programmes should stress the training of instructors, and the selection of trainees limited to persons with a certain level of skill, particularly from the technical and linguistic points of view, who were better able to absorb the knowledge and pass it on to their countrymen back home.

Finally, an objective evaluation of the Centre's activities and of the impact of its various programmes would have to be made. The beneficiary countries sometimes failed to send in detailed reports, and it was for the Centre to gather any missing information to see at all times how it stood.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) considered that the documents before the Governing Body did not give its members the full and detailed information they had expected. As a result, it was difficult to form an opinion of the present situation, requirements and future prospects of the Turin Centre.

One thing was clear, and that was that the Centre was useful to the developing countries although its operation suffered from a number of shortcomings. Workers' education, for example, a major ILO activity, was not being sufficiently developed. There were about 200 persons on the staff, and it seemed questionable whether that figure corresponded to actual requirements. Expenditure was too high and the deficit amounted to $4.5 million despite the contribution of $1.5 million paid last November out of the ILO's regular budget. The report did not make any reference to views expressed by trainees on the instruction received at the Centre; opinions, it seemed, were extremely divided, but at any rate it would be useful to be informed of them.

In the absence of precise information on such matters, it seemed very difficult to come to a decision on the future of the Centre. The Governing Body should therefore have before it the full picture as regards the Centre's programmes and their content, and the lines along which it might develop.

Mr. Garcia (Government, United Kingdom) confirmed his Government's position as recorded in paragraph 23 of the report and endorsed the recommendations in paragraph 75.
As the next step the Director-General had undertaken to make a thorough review, in May or November, of the relationships between the bodies operating in Turin and the ILO Governing Body. The United Kingdom Government looked forward with keen interest to receiving that material and also the further information on how the ILO would try to meet the developing countries' unquestionable needs for advanced vocational and technical training.

Meanwhile, it was to be hoped that the new Director's efforts to reform the management and staffing of the Centre would be actively pursued and that the Governing Body would be kept informed.

Mr. Stemple (Government, Guyana), whose views were summarised in paragraph 39 of the report, supported the recommendations in paragraph 75 as a short-term solution, if only because the debts incurred by the Centre had to be repaid. There seemed, however, to be less than full agreement on the role the Centre should play and how it should be operated.

It had been stressed repeatedly that the developing nations needed the Centre's services, and some of those countries had undoubtedly derived considerable benefit from its activities; but a careful study of the figures submitted to the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee showed, nevertheless, that many developing countries had not so benefited because the number of trainees they had been able to send was far less than that of other countries.

The motives that had prompted the setting up of the Turin Centre had no doubt been laudable at the time, but it was questionable whether it had subsequently fulfilled the hopes placed in it. That problem would certainly have to be reconsidered, because it was not normal that certain countries should derive greater benefit from the Centre than others. The Centre had been created for all the developing countries without distinction and all of them should have equal access to its services.

Mr. Mainwaring (Government, Canada) pointed out that his Government's position was recorded in paragraph 24 of the report.

He fully supported the approach advocated by Mr. Oechslin, namely to start by evaluating training needs, then to study how best to meet them and, thirdly, to see how Turin could fit into the general picture. Account should be taken, in an objective spirit, of the concern expressed by many members of the Governing Body, bearing in mind that what mattered above all was to provide as much training as possible, and to do so as efficiently and effectively as possible.

It appeared from the statement made by Mr. Ventejol that the French Government might consider increasing its financial support, either directly or in concert with other European countries. That very important statement would undoubtedly influence the attitude of the Canadian Government towards the Centre's problems.

Mr. Aboughanem had undertaken creditable efforts to put the Centre back on a sound footing and it was to be hoped that he would be given the time to carry out the necessary reforms.

The information called for in paragraph 75(d) of the report was essential and it would be very interesting to reconsider the matter in November or during the discussions on the Director-General's programme and budget proposals.

Canada fully supported the ILO's efforts to meet the training needs of the developing countries, but all existing alternatives in that regard should be explored and if, for example, it appeared that the strengthening of regional or subregional institutions would be more useful than the Turin Centre, the necessary consequences would have to be drawn.

Mr. Martini Dradaneta (Government, Venezuela), stressing the importance his country attached to workers' education and vocational training, said that with the Turin Centre, an institution specialising in those fields, it should be possible to achieve better results than those achieved so far.

The answer, therefore, was not to close down the Centre but to improve its methods, increase its productivity and make fuller use of its facilities. Many developing countries had already benefited from its activities and more of them certainly would if efforts were made to make the Centre more widely known throughout the world.
Contacts with training centres in other countries, and especially in South America, should also be intensified; it might be possible to organise joint programmes with those countries in order to make the programmes more effective and consider decentralising a number of activities to such centres.

Mr. de Icaza (Government, Mexico) asked that paragraphs 32 and 33 of the report, which summarised his Government's position, should be fully reproduced in the minutes. Those paragraphs read as follows:

32. The representative of the Government of Mexico said that the process of analysing the situation of the Turin Centre was becoming a permanent element in the Committee's discussions. The report now before the Committee described the Centre's present position and the measures taken so far to solve its problems; it also put forward certain hypotheses for the future, but regrettably not the full range of alternatives which had been asked for by the Committee at the November session and which would have provided a broader basis for decision. While her Government had not so far supported the closing of the Centre, it did not necessarily share the view that an improvement of the financial situation would resolve all the problems at issue. The Centre's operating methods, which were inadequate as a means of achieving its objectives, urgently needed to be brought up to date in order to overcome the administrative and financial shortcomings which in turn had led to a deterioration in the academic and technical services which the Centre should be offering. Her Government felt that the proposals in paragraph 61 would not by themselves resolve this situation. Apart from the urgency of the financial aspect, it was necessary to tackle the other side of the problem at the same time - to develop an institution which would provide vocational and technical training at various levels, primarily for developing countries in all regions; the problem therefore was also one of restructuring programmes.

In that connection her Government had on several occasions suggested that programmes should be decentralised; that would help to consolidate the Centre's role as a nucleus of support for the various regional training centres. It was also necessary to reassess the Centre's objectives; should it concentrate on training or should it also contribute to the preparation of specialised teaching materials for use at the appropriate national or regional levels? That type of activity, undertaken in collaboration with the ILO's regional offices and local higher education centres, including the ILO's own regional vocational training programmes, could have a significant multiplier effect at a lower cost, and would represent a return to the Centre's original objective of assisting developing countries in the development and application of vocational training policies.

33. Turning to the suggestion of incorporating the Centre's activities into the ILO's programmes, the representative of the Government of Mexico asked what would be the consequences for the Centre's personnel, and into which major programme would the Centre be incorporated. If, as appeared likely, there was to be more than one programme, she said, the cost of the budget for the Centre would represent over 80 per cent more than the total cost of Programme 70. In that case, how many officials would be charged to that programme and what would be their grades? If, alternatively, a majority of the Governing Body were in favour of closure, which did not seem to be the case - it would rest with the Conference to take the final decision. If the suggestion in paragraph 62 of the report were to be adopted it would seem appropriate that a detailed and coherent programme for the integration of the Centre into the ILO should be submitted to the Conference as a basis for further analysis and discussion. Did the UNDP, for its part, consider that the Centre had a coherent, appropriate and co-ordinated programme which pursued the aims and objectives for which it had been established? Was there any assurance that the UNDP would continue to give financial assistance to the Centre? The present report gave rise to these and other questions but did not provide any answers. Various members of the Committee had confirmed that the Centre's activities could be carried out with equal or greater effectiveness in the regions but that alternative, its financial consequences and its technical impact had also not been included in the report. Requests for support and assistance confirmed that there was an urgent and growing need to elaborate the Centre's activities into a coherent programme, whether by complete or partial decentralisation to national centres; that would not necessarily mean closing the Centre, but if Programme 70 were to be strengthened by the incorporation of the Centre's activities, it was essential to know what that programme would consist of in the future. The
second paper did not provide sufficient justification for integration which would increase the ILO's programme and budget for 1980 alone by some $3.8 million, including the $2.5 million in bank loans; but closing the Centre would involve a cost of some $6 million, so either course of action would result in very heavy costs. If it were decided to incorporate the Centre into the ILO's regular budget, the Conference must have full details of the programmes proposed for the Centre, which should be clearly in line with the 1980-81 programme and budget it had approved last June. Her Government could not unfortunately approve any decision which would involve a financial commitment, such as that envisaged in paragraph 61, unless a specific programme for the Centre could be provided, which would have to be brought to the attention of the competent authorities in Mexico.

The speaker added that he had been especially interested by Mr. Oechslin's earlier statement.

Mr. Konané-France (Government, Ivory Coast) fully concurred with the ideas expressed by the representative of the Government of Tunisia in the Committee, as recorded in the report, and welcomed the constructive statements made by the various Employer spokesmen, as recorded in paragraphs 4, 6, 7 and 8, as well as Mr. Huhr's point of view summarised in paragraph 5.

The recommendations in paragraph 75 were supported by his Government, which, however, had reservations on paragraph 50. That paragraph, though faithful to the spirit of the statement made on behalf of the African Governments, suggested that some part of their UNDP allocations should be channelled to the Centre, whereas the Government of the Ivory Coast considered that discretion in the matter should rest with governments, who alone were competent to set national development priorities.

Mr. Nair (Government, India), while recognising the part the Turin Centre was called upon to play in the training field, doubted whether the developing countries derived maximum benefit from its activities as currently organised. The financial difficulties it faced might be due not only to inflation, currency fluctuations and the postponement or cancellation of courses financed from other sources, but also to less than fully efficient management and inadequate utilisation of the teaching facilities and equipment available at the Centre, resulting in particular from the dependence of the tailor-made courses on contributions from the governments concerned.

Many countries had training facilities in areas traditionally covered by the Turin Centre and, as Mr. Martini Urdaneta had suggested, regional training centres could perhaps be developed and certain programmes transferred to them; that might be better than concentrating all training activities in Turin. Such a solution would be both more efficient and less costly. The regional centres could train instructors and highly skilled workers and technicians, while the Turin Centre would concentrate on research and on the design, production and dissemination of teaching material; it could also organise meetings for discussing and comparing the results of national and regional programmes.

The recommendations in paragraph 75 could be adopted, but the report the Director-General would be submitting in November should cover the suggestions just made, since it might appear, as a result, that the Turin Centre did not need an annual ILO subsidy after all.

Mr. Nuck (Government, German Democratic Republic) confirmed his Government's position as recorded in paragraphs 41 and 63 of the report.

He had been somewhat disappointed by the material submitted by the Office. He had expected an answer to the questions and requests put forward at the previous session, and in particular an in-depth analysis of the Centre's activities, providing details of the use which developing countries and the trade unions made of the Centre. Information should have been provided on the content of the training programmes, including indications regarding future activities and means of enhancing the efficiency and productive capacity of the Centre.

In the absence of such information, the Government of the German Democratic Republic found difficulty in taking a decision with implications for the future. It did not wish to place the Organisation a blank cheque for additional financial support to Turin because that would necessarily involve a substantial increase in the Organisation's budget and higher contributions from member States. The Government could not, therefore, support the recommendations in paragraph 75 of the report.
Mr. Sangtong (Government, Thailand) confirmed his Government's point of view recorded in paragraph 40 of the report. Since the issue had already been discussed at great length last November and again during the present session, he saw no need for postponing a decision and could support the recommendations in paragraph 75.

Mr. Ajai (Government, Nigeria) fully supported the recommendations in paragraph 75, subparagraph (d), which seemed to constitute an acceptable compromise.

The original position of the African group was that the Centre should be placed on the same footing as the International Institute for Labour Studies. At present, however, while there was no question of casting doubt on the high value of the work done by the Institute, there were, in connection with the Turin Centre, certain facts which had to be borne in mind.

First, the Centre's main function was to provide technical assistance for the developing countries, and it therefore had special relevance for Africa, as attested by the resolution adopted by the African Labour Ministers in Mogadiscio in 1979. Secondly, the Centre had so far trained 15,236 persons from member States. Thirdly, it had carried out considerable research and documentation activities with other United Nations specialised agencies. Fourthly, the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination had recognised the Turin Centre as the focal point for technical education in the United Nations system.

Suggestions had been put forward for decentralising certain activities in favour of regional or subregional centres. In fact, a converse solution would be more appropriate and efforts should be made at regional and subregional levels to supplement what Turin was trying to do at the world level.

It was even more surprising to hear suggestions that the Centre should be closed down or that it should not qualify for ILO regular budget support.

Only the compromise recommendations in paragraph 75 of the report would enable the Turin Centre to perform its vital international role. Decentralisation of its activities would damage beyond repair its capacity to fulfil its mandate; and while there were doubtless reforms that could be made to reduce costs and enhance efficiency, the Director-General's assurance that he was working to achieve them ought to dispel any fears in that regard.

Further discussion on the fourth report was postponed until later.1

EIGHTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General

Sixth Supplementary Report

Appointment of Assistant Director-General

The Director-General did not think it necessary to introduce Mr. Elimane Kane, whom many members of the Governing Body already knew, but he wished to explain why he had decided to promote Mr. Kane to the grade of Assistant Director-General.

In making the appointment, after due consultation with the Officers of the Governing Body, he had been motivated in the first place by a desire to appoint a senior ILO staff member to a top management position.

Secondly - and principally - he had been guided by Mr. Kane's exceptional qualities: his intelligence and judgement, the strength of his convictions, his commitment to the ILO's principles of freedom and justice and his loyalty, which flowed directly from his perfect integrity.

1 See below, pp. VII/9.

2 See also eighth sitting.
The Chairman invited Mr. Kane to make the declaration of loyalty provided for in article 1.4(b) of the Staff Regulations.

Mr. Kane read out the declaration of loyalty.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), speaking for all the members of his group, and particularly those from Africa, expressed their great joy at seeing their friend Elimane Kane appointed to a post of Assistant Director-General. He was a young official with many qualities, which he had acquired first of all in his home country, then on the Workers' bench, where he had gained personal experience of tripartism, and finally within the Office, where he had already held very important posts. The Director-General could not have made a better choice, the more so since it was always a pleasure to see an African official rise to high office; the Employers wished the new Assistant Director-General every success.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman), speaking for the Worker members, congratulated their colleague Elimane Kane most sincerely on his appointment. None of the Worker members had forgotten the time when he had sat among them and everyone was well aware of his deep commitment to the principles of the ILO. The Workers were in a good position to judge him, and they knew that he was fully qualified for his new job and that he would discharge his duties with the highest degree of rectitude. The Director-General was to be congratulated on having put the right man in the right place at the right time. Congratulations should be extended also to the wife and family of the new Assistant Director-General, who had always played an important part in his life.

Mr. Sow (Worker, Mauritania) was pleased to support the appointment of Mr. Elimane Kane to the post of Assistant Director-General. He was especially happy that the Director-General had promoted to that grade not only an African, but a Mauritanian, and, what was more, a former trade unionist whose career had been so largely and closely linked to the struggle of the Mauritanian workers, and whose competence and loyalty were so well known. He wished Mr. Elimane Kane every success and associated Mrs. Kane in the tribute paid to her husband.

Mr. Musiko (Government, Kenya) congratulated Mr. Kane on behalf of his Government and of the entire African group. For several years the African continent had been insisting on adequate representation on the ILO staff at all levels. Much still remained to be done to achieve that objective, but the Director-General's decision was a step in the right direction and he should be congratulated for it.

Mr. Kane could rely firmly on the full co-operation of his African friends, who, knowing his qualifications and experience, were convinced that he would succeed in his new task.

Mrs. Kane, finally, should be thanked for the valuable aid she gave her husband.

Miss González Martínez (Government, Mexico) congratulated Mr. Elimane Kane on behalf of the entire Government group.

In the highly responsible posts he had filled within the Office over the past 12 years, Mr. Kane had always discharged his duties with the utmost efficiency and, in New York especially, he had shown the extent of his loyalty to the objectives, principles and programmes of the Organisation. He would undoubtedly pursue his active efforts in defence of the workers. Congratulations were due also to Mrs. Kane who had always given her husband aid and comfort.

Mr. Ajaí (Government, Nigeria) welcomed Mr. Kane's appointment. He personally had always had excellent relations with the new Assistant Director-General and was fully familiar with his qualities. The Nigerian Government would always give him the necessary support in the discharge of his new and high responsibilities. Mr. Musiko had done well to express the hope that some day full account would be taken of regional distribution for all appointments within the Office, and in particular for posts of Deputy Director-General.

Mr. Fogarty (Government, Australia) associated the Asian countries with the congratulations to the new Assistant Director-General. The Director-General's decision was especially fortunate in the light of Mr. Kane's record, which made it abundantly clear how well fitted he was for the duties entrusted to him. The Asian members congratulated his wisely, together with his wife and family, and hoped they would long have the pleasure of working with him.
Mr. Ventiel (Government, France) had always been struck by Mr. Kane's competence as well as by his kindness; those were two important qualities which did not necessarily go hand in hand, but Mr. Kane combined them very effectively. His extensive personal experience of trade unionism was particularly important, and he had time and again given proof of his human qualities. The French Government associated itself very sincerely with the tribute paid to Mr. Kane.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) congratulated the Director-General on his choice and Mr. Elimane Kane on his well-deserved appointment. He was very glad of it and wished Mr. Kane all success.

The Chairman said how sincerely pleased he was with Mr. Kane's promotion, which was a tribute to Africa, to Mr. Kane's professional value and to the confidence of his seniors. Great hopes would be placed in him from now on so that, through his zeal and a realistic, far-sighted and courageous approach to his responsibilities, he might act as a beacon guiding the ILO's work in the young countries of Africa.

The Chairman looked forward to co-operating with Mr. Kane and wished him every success. In the tributes to him he associated Mrs. Kane, the discreet and obliging companion who had always stood by his side and helped him through the difficult periods of life.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

Fourth report (concl.)

Report on the Turin Centre (concl.)

Miss Silva y Silva (Government, Peru), whose Government's position was reflected in paragraph 25 of the Committee's report, reaffirmed her confidence in what the Turin Centre could do for developing countries everywhere provided it was properly supported and guided.

She was pleased that paragraph 75(d) embodied the amendment which the Employers' group had proposed to reflect the views expressed by the representatives of those countries concerning their real vocational training needs.

Mr. Kysely (Government, Czechoslovakia) considered that past experience with the Turin Centre over the years afforded a basis for drawing at least some conclusions. The Centre had no doubt made a contribution toward the training of staff in various countries, although the number of trainees had not always been as high as might have been hoped. On the whole, experience so far was inadequate as a basis for a really responsible decision concerning its ultimate fate.

The Government of Czechoslovakia had in the past criticised the composition of the Turin teaching staff, the content of the courses and the origin of participants. Those were the reasons that had determined its attitude towards the financing of the Centre. At the moment the situation was extremely complex and it was difficult to foresee the future; further information was therefore needed before a decision could be taken.

Mr. Navaya (Government, Niger) endorsed what had been said by the representative of the Government of Nigeria. The Turin Centre was a unique instrument of co-operation in support of ILO technical programmes. He also shared the views expressed by the representative of the Government of the Ivory Coast: the extent and diversity of their needs compelled the various countries to use their UNDP resources selectively.

1 See also sixth and eighth sittings.
The main concern of the African countries was, however, that the ILO should assume full responsibility for the Centre because, despite the stringent selection system imposed by the high costs of its training activities, they were deeply attached to it and earnestly hoped that it would be able to continue its task. Considerable changes were no doubt needed to adapt and rationalise its operation, and determined efforts would have to be made during the transitional period to find a solution for the next biennium.

That would require a full measure of international solidarity, both as between developing countries and as between advanced nations and developing ones. The Turin Centre was not a gamble, but perhaps a bet on what everyone hoped would be a better future. To the developing countries it represented a springboard for acquiring needed technologies, sharing in balanced exchanges and playing their full part in the dialogue between nations.

The African group fully endorsed the report, especially paragraphs 29 to 31 and 50, and earnestly hoped that the Governing Body would take action beyond the recommendations in paragraph 75.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) pointed out that his Government's views were reflected in paragraph 34 of the report. He supported the statements made by the Employer Vice-Chairman and the representative of the Government of Bangladesh; he also welcomed the prospect of France eventually resuming its financial assistance to Turin, either alone or through the EEC.

His statement in the Committee about regional centres seemed to have been misunderstood. He had not confused Turin with ARSDEP or CIADFPOB, but had merely suggested that the centres of excellence in the various countries should be converted into prototypes of Turin and take over a part, if not all, of the functions currently performed by the Centre.

Mr. Abou Assi (Government, Lebanon) was convinced that all agreed on the need to maintain the Turin Centre. His own instructions were to oppose closing down the Centre, whose work in favour of the developing countries was essential.

On the matter of finance and operating arrangements, he fully supported the recommendations at the end of the report.

Mr. Jimenez de Parga (Government, Spain) recognised that the idea from which the Centre had originated and the mission entrusted to it were eminently worth while, as seemed generally agreed. From a social policy point of view the picture was therefore satisfying. The financial picture, however, was not. Organisational and managerial shortcomings had brought on a situation which was dangerously, not to say catastrophically, unbalanced.

Since the measures adopted so far had proved ineffective, others had to be planned and urgent action taken to stabilise the Centre's budget. The Governing Body should be honestly and fully informed of the facts, so that it might make a responsible decision.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) fully endorsed the statements made by Mr. Oechslin and Mr. Huhr, and thanked Dr. Ventejol for his tribute to the efforts made by Italy. Those efforts would be continued and, so far as possible, extended provided that the Centre was put on a sound and efficient operating basis. It was gratifying to note from Mr. Mainwaring's remarks that the indications given by Mr. Ventejol might have set off a sort of "chain reaction".

An in-depth study of the specific function performed by the Centre as one of the instruments available to the ILO in coping with the ever-increasing demand for vocational training, especially in the developing countries, would be most useful. It should be carried out without indulgence and explore all the alternatives, without however overlooking those functions performed by the Centre - for example as a focal point and a catalyst - for which a substitute would be hard to find.

The setting up of regional centres had been considered as an alternative, but what weight would they carry when measured against the funds already invested in the Turin Centre and the technical and educational experience it had accumulated? In point of fact the best might be aimed at establishing fruitful operational links between Turin and certain well-structured regional centres like CIADFPOB, CIADFPOR and ARSDEP, which could serve as dynamic instruments to extend the scope of
the Turin Centre's activity and, by the same token, widen the ILO's own range of essential services in the essential area of training; but to close down the Turin Centre overnight, with the idea of setting up regional centres, would spell certain disaster, both operationally and financially.

Another possibility might be to set up a scientific bureau including representatives of the Turin Centre and of the three major regional bodies already mentioned, which could, in a more concrete manner than the present Programme Advisory Committee, help to promote more effective and vigorous ILO action at the regional level; it would, however, be a serious mistake to try to turn Turin into an institute devoted solely to the production of handbooks and other educational material and no longer engaged in actual training; for to be effective such theoretical work had to be based on direct operational experience.

Two useful ideas had been put forward during the debate. It had first of all been suggested that Turin should make itself better known to the general public and to potential users, and that governments planning their vocational training programmes should be informed of the programmes and structure of the Centre and of what it could offer. The second idea put forward was that trainees should not be lost sight of on their return home, and such follow-up action would indeed make it possible to assess the value of the training given, to improve it and keep more closely in touch with the situation in the various countries.

Finally, in the face of all the alarmist talk of impending financial disaster it might not be inappropriate to point out that the mere appointment of a man of Mr. Aboughanem's ability and energy as Director of the Centre had already made it possible to balance the budget for 1980. That was perhaps an idea worth reflecting on.

The Director-General noted that the Governing Body, without in any way prejudging the future of the Centre, had wanted to allow itself extra time for reflection with a view to reaching a clear-cut final decision. The reasons were, first, that the Centre had to be put back on an even keel, and that in fact was currently being done since, as Mr. Falchi had just observed, the budget would be balanced in 1980 - and also, there was every reason to hope, in 1981 - and, secondly, that the Governing Body wanted to take a considered comprehensive decision covering all the problems relating to the Turin Centre.

The real questions had been formulated during the debate, first of all by Br. Ochsln: what were the needs of member States? What were the costs in Turin? Has there a real need for the Centre? In what way was it unique? An answer would be given to all those questions, which might be viewed from three angles.

The first was that of the beneficiary countries, which should help the Organisation and help themselves in defining their needs and what they thought should be the distinctive role of the Turin Centre within the over-all context of ILO activities.

The second point of view was that of the ILO, and in the coming months the Office would try to evaluate training needs at all levels (training proper, training of instructors, advanced training, etc.) in co-operation with the beneficiaries. It would be a difficult task because such needs were changing constantly, but every effort would be made to arrive at a quantitative as well as qualitative assessment.

The third point of view was that of the industrialised countries, which had expressed reservations about the Turin Centre or, at least, about its uniqueness. Having themselves launched large-scale basic and advanced training programmes for the developing countries, they could give the ILO valuable help in determining training requirements. It would be surprising if, in so doing, they failed to see good reasons for maintaining the Centre, which was only a link in a world-wide chain of ILO-related facilities and an integral part of the training activities which the ILO had been carrying on at all levels for 30 years.

It was a good thing that, for the first time, both the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee and the Governing Body had had an opportunity to take a comprehensive approach to the problem, and the prospects for putting the Centre back on a sound footing could already be described as encouraging. Decisions still had to be reached, not merely to ensure the survival of the Centre, but to take a major step towards enabling it to meet the enormous training needs of the developing countries, and also the advanced ones.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 75 of the report.

The sitting closed at 1:15 p.m.
The sitting opened at 3.20 p.m. under the chairmanship of Mr. Pontso.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

Third report

ILO Medium-Term Plan 1982-87

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) hoped that, since the Medium-Term Plan had been discussed at length in the Committee, the Governing Body would not embark on a new debate on the substance.

Some thought might be given to the presentation of the Plan, however: had a shorter document been submitted the discussion itself might have been shorter and less concerned with details. On a future occasion the Director-General might find it helpful to consult some of the members of the Governing Body on what might be a more suitable approach.

The exercise had nevertheless been useful and the Employer members supported the Plan. As was clear from the Director-General's reply to the discussion, the latter provided a good frame of reference for the ILO's activities over the next six years.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the Workers' dissatisfaction with the method used for considering the Medium-Term Plan. Only those who were members of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee had had an opportunity to comment on it, and if the group had not pressed a proposal to adjourn the discussion until May, it was because the Plan was in any case going to be discussed again at the Conference, and also because, unlike a programme and budget, it did not call for any decisions. The preparation in February next year of a draft Programme and Budget for 1982-83 would give the Governing Body an opportunity for an initial assessment of the implications of the Plan on the basis of a more thorough discussion.

The Plan had the merit of highlighting the means of action to be used in the pursuit of the ILO's objectives and duly reflecting the decisions of the main ILO bodies regarding, for instance, the follow-up of the World Employment Conference and the implementation of the PIACT. It also reflected the conclusions of the Governing Body concerning international labour standards and provided for a strengthening of the ILO's sectoral activities, in accordance with a wish long held by the Workers.

On the strictly financial aspects the Workers considered it unjustifiable that, because of the temporary withdrawal of the United States, ILO programmes should remain at a reduced level for more than ten years, since the 1975 level of activity would not be restored until 1987.

Further to the views recorded on their behalf in paragraph 152 of the report concerning the struggle against apartheid, the Workers wished to point out that in the newly independent countries - of which Zimbabwe was one and Namibia might soon become another - the problem would be that of dealing with the aftermath of apartheid, and it would be a major medium-term ILO undertaking.

Mr. de la Icaza (Government, Mexico) felt that, even if it did not call for a Governing Body decision, the Plan provided a useful frame of reference for the ILO's

\[\text{See sixth and seventh sittings.}\]
work over the next few years, and he thanked the Office for the vast amount of work that had gone into it.

It was unfortunate, however, that the introduction and the first part of the document, which admirably described the challenges facing the labour world in the 1980s, were not matched by Part II, which was far too timid in its specific programme proposals. Those proposals should have made it clear what concrete action was contemplated to meet the challenges outlined earlier.

The Mexican Government's position on the Plan was recorded in paragraphs 89 to 91 of the report.

Mr. Mainwaring (Government, Canada), who had acted as Chairman of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, drew attention to paragraph 276 of the report, which reflected certain views he had expressed about the method the Committee should follow in considering medium-term plans and similar topics. He had also raised the matter in the Government group, where it had been suggested that he should share his views with the Governing Body as a whole.

To begin with, although everyone agreed on the high quality of the document submitted, was such a purely descriptive text really the right kind of paper for the purpose? Would it not have been preferable to prepare a much shorter one - say 10 to 20 pages long - offering a wider range of options and including specific points for decision?

A question which arose, in particular, was that of priorities for the different programmes. The Plan did contain a table, which appeared at the end and where the Office gave estimates of the growth of individual programmes, but the Committee had hardly had time to discuss the relative importance of either the programmes themselves or the various means of action - i.e. research as compared with technical co-operation, technical missions, meetings, and so on. Questions had been raised on these matters, but not with a view to decisions.

Then, the debate itself had created problems: on the Government side alone some 15 of the 18 regular members and 10 of the 19 substitutes had taken part in the general debate, and a number of specific questions had been asked. More such questions had been asked later on, during the discussion on individual programmes, which had continued late into the evening of the last day. Had the Director-General tried to reply to all the questions during the debate, the Committee would never have concluded its work on time. The Director-General had, however, wisely decided to speak only at the end of the debate, and then had given a very good indication of the general direction the Office would take in relation to the various matters; but as he had not had time to reply in detail to all the points made, there had not really been a dialogue between the members of the Committee and the Office of the kind that was so desirable and important when a medium-term plan or an in-depth review was being considered.

Perhaps the Governing Body should review its working methods for discussing such important matters, including the possible setting up of a special working party. A number of interesting suggestions had been made within the Government group concerning ways of organising the work of not only the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee but also the other committees. Once the current work on the structure of the Organisation was completed it might be appropriate to re-examine the committee structure of the Governing Body, and in particular arrangements for the discussion of programme questions in committees prior to their consideration by the Governing Body.

The working party might give consideration, in particular, to the setting up of a small subcommittee of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, which would provide an opportunity for dialogue between its members and representatives of the Office. If that suggestion was agreeable, the Governing Body should take a decision before the end of its present mandate i.e. before June 1981.

Mr. Tudor (Government, Romania), referring to paragraphs 30 to 38 of the report, said that his Government's view of the next six years was rather more optimistic than that reflected in the Medium-Term Plan, particularly with respect to the industrial growth rate and the level of employment.

With regard to vocational training, the ILO should play an increasingly active international role as a catalyst, in response to the growing concern for man as a factor of development.

E-4221-2:8
As regards Mr. Mainwaring's proposal for setting up a small subcommittee to examine the Organisation's plans, it would be better to give all countries an opportunity to express their views on documents formulating development strategies for the future.

Mr. Ali (Government, Nigeria), speaking for the African Government members, whose views were recorded in paragraphs 76 to 79 of the report, expressed doubt as to whether any medium-term plan could be kept down to 10 or 20 pages; situations were too diverse for that. Many members would no doubt prefer the present format combining philosophical considerations with a survey of the world situation and a rational presentation of programme proposals.

The Labour Commission of the Organisation of African Unity would be fully briefed on the Plan at its forthcoming meeting. Furthermore, the ILO African Advisory Committee, which was expected to meet early in 1981, might wish to recommend that the Sixth African Regional Conference should examine the Plan's implications for Africa. It should also be possible for these various bodies to express their views during the biennial reviews of the Plan.

Mr. Isacsson (Government, Sweden) felt that the Medium-Term Plan raised two questions. First, did it, in its present form, provide a sound basis for the deliberations? Secondly, could the procedures of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee provide the kind of guidance the Office needed? On the whole, both questions could be answered affirmatively.

It was, however, important that all the member States should be involved in the preparation of the plans through the regional structure of the ILO - thereby, incidentally, helping to promote decentralisation - and that regional experience should be duly reflected in future ILO activities.

As to the procedure for discussing the Plan, its main purpose should be to give the Office guidelines for implementing the programmes and preparing the biennial budgets. That purpose would be defeated if the Plan were to give rise to a detailed discussion such as took place on the programme and budget. The figures in the present Plan reflecting a slow-down in the growth of certain activities, for instance, should be viewed as purely indicative and the extent of programme growth should only be decided in connection with the next budget.

The ILO needed increased resources - resources to match its ambitions, to quote the words used by the Director-General in the Committee. In allocating additional resources priority should be given to those programmes which had suffered most from the recent cutbacks. Unfortunately, the Plan did not propose any priorities, and no consensus on priorities had come to light during the debate, no doubt because of the great diversity of national needs. The Committee had, however, unanimously recognised the need to promote international labour standards and to protect human rights. It was gratifying to note, too, the provision for studies on the application of existing anti-discrimination instruments and for promoting new standards of a general nature to ensure real equality for all workers, not just those with family responsibilities.

The Swedish Government attached great importance to the proposed evaluation of the first phase of the PIAC. It also hoped that it would be possible to give effect to the 1979 Conference resolution concerning handicapped persons by including an item on the problems of the handicapped - a highly vulnerable group - in the agenda of an early session of the Conference.

Mr. Kostenin (Government, USSR), while he did not share the Medium-Term Plan's basic pessimism, viewed it as a positive effort towards increasing the effectiveness of the ILO. He could support a number of its ideas, particularly the concept that standard-setting should remain the cornerstone of the Organisation's work. However, the global approach used in analysing the world's social and economic problems had stood in the way of a proper emphasis on the measures the ILO should take to deal with the acute problems of the day such as rising unemployment, the social and economic consequences of colonialism in newly independent countries, wages, inflation, equal treatment for men and women workers, and the problem of migrant workers.

Admittedly, the Plan should not be assimilated to a budget but, at a time when most member States were particularly budget-conscious, it should have reflected a greater awareness of the ILO's financial constraints. It should be possible to
curtail or eliminate less important programmes that constitutionally did not fall within the competence of the ILO and could be carried out by other bodies within the United Nations system - research projects, for instance. The Organisation might well, on the other hand, assume certain new tasks in order to give effect to decisions taken by the Conference at its last session and by the Third European Regional Conference.

The Office would no doubt study very carefully the discussions in both the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee and the Governing Body, and bear them in mind in the preparation of programme proposals for the forthcoming biennia. To ensure a more constructive discussion documents of the present type - particularly the long-term plans - should contain concrete proposals, supported by cost estimates, and reflect the guidance given by the General Conference and the regional conferences. Only then would they truly reflect the views of all the member States and constituents of the ILO.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) referred to his Government's views recorded in paragraphs 95 to 102 of the report. The resources allocated to Asia - the region in which, according to the Plan itself, the needs were greatest - should be increased and vocational training and employment promotion should receive larger allocations.

While Mr. Maimvaring had been right to stress the need for a real dialogue between the Governing Body and the Office, it would not be appropriate for the responsibilities of the Governing Body or of its committees to be turned over to small working parties.

Mr. Ha'ir (Government, India), after pointing out that his Government's views were recorded in paragraphs 107 to 113 of the report, said the discussion had been very useful in highlighting the needs and concerns of both the developing and the industrially advanced countries. It should be taken fully into account in future biennial programmes. In view of the wishes that had been expressed during the debate, it was understandable that the Director-General had not been able immediately to give all the information asked for, but it was to be hoped that the Office would try to give effect to the wishes that had received a large measure of support.

Mr. Maimvaring had rightly suggested that the dialogue between the Office and the Governing Body on such major documents needed to be improved. On the other hand, it was difficult to criticise the length of a document which, after all, covered a period of six years.

Mr. Delarbre (Government, France) wondered whether there was any point in repeating in the Governing Body what had already been said in the Committee, particularly as the June Conference would have before it not only the Plan but also the Committee's third report and the minutes of the present Governing Body sitting. That would surely give a maximum number of member States a full share in the framing of the Medium-Term Plan.

Mr. Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) pointed out that his Government's various comments on the Plan were recorded throughout the section of the report dealing with the discussion on the major programmes. He hoped that the Office would study those comments carefully when preparing its programme and budget proposals for 1982-83.

He regretted that the Director-General had not specifically taken up some of the important proposals made during the debate. Had he done so, it would have improved the dialogue between the Committee and the Office.

For the next stage in the examination of the Plan, which would take place at the 66th Session of the Conference, the Plan in its present form and the third report of the Committee, which summarised the discussion, should be sent as soon as possible to the governments of all member States and, through them, to the employers' and workers' organisations so that they would be ready for the Conference discussions.

Mr. Jiménez de Parça (Government, Spain) felt that, after the detailed review in the Committee, it might be useful for the Governing Body now to take a look at the Plan as a whole. Part I gave a rather dark picture of the world today and of the immediate future, in contrast with the other parts which suggested action to meet the situation.
The Plan - intelligent and well drafted as it was - seemed to have been prepared with a specific civilisation pattern in view - a civilisation for whose ills, as stated in paragraph 1.5 of the Plan, there was only one remedy: "More growth - in other words, more investment, more production, more trade." There were, however, other patterns of development, and it might have been more in keeping with the ILO's universal role to give more thought to measures likely to improve the lot of the millions who drew no benefit from economic development and who, as even the Plan forecast, might well die of hunger.

The ILO should never become a passive observer within a supposedly untouchable international economic order, but devote all its energies to transforming that order. The Committee on Freedom of Association, for instance, should act of its own motion whenever it learned of violations of human or trade union rights; it should not wait for a complaint to be formally lodged.

The same innovative spirit should guide it in the pursuit of its other objectives and in its campaign against such scourges as unemployment, which had reached alarming proportions even in those countries which only yesterday were enjoying prosperity through economic growth.

Mr. Sanatong (Government, Thailand) drew attention to his Government's views as summarised in paragraphs 122 to 124 and 207 of the report.

Mr. Garcia (Government, United Kingdom) observed that while the discussion on the Medium-Term Plan had undoubtedly been useful it had been difficult to organise, owing particularly to the structure of the basic document, which passed a little too easily from general background in Part I to detailed proposals in Part II. Since the whole purpose of the exercise was to enable the Governing Body to discuss the strategic choices before the Organisation, it might be preferable in future to provide only such information as would enable the Governing Body to set the major emphases for ILO activities during the Plan period. To submit a sort of preliminary budget, as had been done this time, was not really necessary. In that connection, Mr. Mainwaring's suggestions seemed well worth following up.

Could the Director-General indicate whether or not the Medium-Term Plan would be submitted to the Conference together with the record of the discussion on it in the Committee and in the Governing Body?

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) wondered whether the working party proposed by Mr. Mainwaring might not look into the practice of repeating in the Governing Body statements already made in the Committee.

Mr. Nakatani (Government, Japan) pointed out that, since neither the Committee nor the Governing Body had reached agreement even on what were the ILO's most effective means of action, perhaps a discussion on the Plan, focused on specific topics, could be continued at the Conference or at the Governing Body session next November. No special working party need be set up for that purpose. The discussion could be open, so as to give everyone an opportunity to participate in it over the next 6 to 12 months.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany), like others, found it surprising that so many who had spoken in the Committee were doing so again in the Governing Body. He would confine his own remarks to the questions of procedure raised by Mr. Mainwaring, whose proposal for setting up a working party he could accept provided the working party's terms of reference were limited to examining the Committee's working methods.

The length of the debate on the Plan showed clearly that all members were keen to take part in it. Perhaps the Chairman of the Committee might recommend members to speak briefly; that would be one way of providing more scope for dialogue with the Office. It was, of course, difficult to keep the discussions in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee within reasonable limits, since the Committee had a particularly wide mandate, but perhaps certain questions - personnel matters for instance - might be referred to a subcommittee, it being understood that the Committee itself would go on considering such important items as medium-terms plans or budgets.

The Director-General was pleased that so much emphasis had been laid on the need for dialogue between the Governing Body and the Office. If he had hesitated to call on chiefs of department to reply to questions or clarify specific points, it
had been partly because he had not wished the Committee to embark on a detailed "budget type" discussion. Besides, he had been anxious that members of the Committee should have a chance to discuss among themselves what should be the guidelines for the future work of the Organisation, a process that in the normal course of events should precede any dialogue with the Office.

To meet the wishes expressed, the Office would do its best, when updating the Plan in 1982 and 1984, to introduce the regional dimension that seemed to be lacking in the present text. Indeed, action along those lines need not wait until then. In the case, for instance, of Africa the Government members from that region would have an opportunity to report on the discussions in the Governing Body at the next meeting of the OAU Labour Commission. Moreover, the Governing Body was called on at its present session to determine the agenda of the Seventh Session of the African Advisory Committee, due to be held early in 1981. Members would then see that the first item proposed was an assessment of the ILO's activities in Africa, including those proposed for the African region in the Medium-Term Plan.

The Plan document had been criticised for being too long, but if it had been limited to Part I only the Office would have laid itself open to criticism for submitting a document that was too brief and too superficial. Efforts would nevertheless be made to cut down the length of such documents and to achieve better co-ordination between the first and second parts. As to the question of priorities, it had seemed preferable merely to provide a summary table in order to avoid a discussion concentrating solely on the financial aspects of the Plan.

Mr. Mainwaring found it unfortunate that the Committee had not spent more time discussing means of action; yet the Director-General had the impression that the Committee had in fact given a whole series of very precise guidelines, particularly with respect to standard setting and also regarding technical co-operation and research activities; these the Office would carefully bear in mind.

Mr. Mainwaring’s suggestion for setting up a working party was worth following up. The Director-General might submit at some stage to the Governing Body a paper pinpointing the problems, including, not least, that of insufficient time.

The Conference, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article llbis of its Standing Orders, would have before it not only the Plan but also the record of the discussion in the Committee and the minutes of the present Governing Body sitting. The latter would be published in one of the early issues of the Conference Provisional Record; the other two documents would be issued as supplements to the Director-General’s Report. The Conference would also have before it the report on programme implementation in 1978-79 which, for lack of time, the Committee had not been able to consider. It would thus have all the background information needed for its discussion of the Plan.

The Office would then have the necessary basis for preparing the programme and budget proposals to be submitted to the Governing Body in February-March 1981. Once that exercise had been completed, it would be time to start updating the Medium-Term Plan in 1982, when every effort would be made to improve the consultative process.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

Mr. Polites (Employer, Australia) said that the Employers' group supported the amendments proposed to the Standing Orders of the Conference. The first of these would help the Conference to control the length of debates in plenary sitting while guaranteeing equal treatment for all participants. The second amendment would make it possible for committees to begin their work without delay while leaving each group free in the matter of nominations for chairman or vice-chairman. The third amendment, bringing forward the deadline for completion of the Resolutions Committee's work, would surely be well received.
With respect to the application of Conventions and Recommendations, the Employers approved the report forms proposed for Conventions Nos. 147 and 152, as well as the revision of the Memorandum concerning the obligation to submit Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities. There had been much discussion on the Memorandum over the past few years and the consensus reached in the Committee on a new method of fulfilling that obligation would strengthen the supervision of the application of standards and forestall acrimonious debate in future.

Lastly, the Employers approved the new Standing Orders on the procedure for the examination of representations, which brought up to date some rather outworn rules.

Mr. Haier (Worker, Austria), speaking for the Workers, supported all the Committee's recommendations, some of which had originated in the Workers' group.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan), whose Government was not represented on the Committee, saw no need to revise the Memorandum, which seemed quite satisfactory as it stood. Whereas the introductory part of the present text was meant only to facilitate the presentation, in standardised form, of information to be submitted to the Director-General, the intention now seemed to be to impose mandatory rules concerning the form in which information should be submitted and how the instruments should be examined.

In Part I of the Memorandum ("Nature of the competent authority") the new paragraph (b), which said that the competent national authority should normally be the legislature, was unnecessary since paragraph (a) already specified that the competent authority was the one which, under the Constitution of each State, had power to legislate or to take other action to implement Conventions and Recommendations. It would be inadvisable to give member States instructions on the matter, as paragraph (b) appeared to do, and so depart from paragraph 5(b) of Article 19 of the ILO Constitution.

The new paragraph (c) of Part I also seemed to be at odds with paragraph 5(b) of Article 19 - which stipulated that Conventions should be submitted to "the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies" - since it added that when the authority was some body other than the legislative assembly it was still desirable to submit instruments to the assembly as well. There was no provision for that in the Constitution.

With respect to the new paragraph (d), which recommended, among other things, bringing instruments to the knowledge of the public, it was difficult to see what that would mean in countries where 80 per cent of the population were illiterate and 19 out of the remaining 20 per cent could not afford to buy a newspaper. In countries like that informing public opinion was an idea of purely academic interest.

Mr. Falchetti (Government, Uruguay) wondered whether it might not have been wiser, in the amendment to the Conference Standing Orders concerning the reduction of the length of speeches in plenary sitting, to specify a minimum time limit below which the duration of a speech could not be cut. It was to be hoped, at least, that the President of the Conference, advised by the Vice-Presidents, would apply the rule judiciously.

As for the revised Memorandum concerning the obligation to submit Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities, it was in no way binding, its purpose being simply to help governments in fulfilling their constitutional obligations towards the ILO. The obligation to submit instruments was, like tripartism, a unique feature of the Organisation.

The Uruguayan Government approved the revised text of the Memorandum, while asking the Office to make sure that the language versions were in full agreement, since that did not seem to be quite the case with the text under consideration.

Mr. Nogack (Government, German Democratic Republic), whose Government was also not represented on the Committee, was far from satisfied with its recommendations.

As regards rationalisation of the work of the Conference, the amendment to reduce the length of speeches in plenary sitting was not justified, particularly if it were to apply to statements in the discussion on the Director-General's Report, which dealt with highly important matters, and it would downgrade the role of the
Conference as the supreme ILO body. As regards the amendment concerning the beginning of the work of committees, was it really possible to elect the vice-chairmen before the chairman, since chairman and vice-chairmen should as a rule come from different countries? It would be better to introduce, for the appointment of committee chairmen, a rotation system as for other elective offices at the Conference. Nor did the amendment relating to completion of the work of the Resolutions Committee seem indispensable, since the Standing Orders already provided for taking a decision to close the debate on any question.

The Memorandum whose revision was being proposed on the obligation to submit instruments to the competent authorities contained merely recommendations which governments were free to follow or to ignore. They were under no formal obligation other than those laid down in Article 19 of the Constitution, and it would not be appropriate to adopt a text suggesting otherwise which might, among other things, encourage further the existing tendency of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations to harass governments with improper questions. The text concerning the nature of the competent authority was badly drafted, suggesting as it did that there was only one correct procedure for submission of Conventions and Recommendations. That entailed a value judgement which the Governing Body was not competent to make.

Under the proposed revision of the procedure for the examination of representations functions hitherto exercised by the Governing Body would be transferred to its Officers or to the committees set up to examine representations: that would amount to downgrading the role of the Governing Body and was quite unacceptable where such an important matter as the submission of representations was concerned. The procedure would be neither speeded up nor simplified. It was not normal, in particular, for the Officers of the Governing Body to determine the receivability of a representation: it was quite conceivable, after all, that a representation should be filed against the government of the Chairman's own country. There would no longer be the same guarantee of impartiality as was provided by the committee set up to consider the representation, of which no representative or national of the country concerned might be a member.

The Government of the German Democratic Republic therefore reserved its position on the changes recommended by the Committee.

Mr. Majumdar (Government, Bangladesh) said that he too was not convinced of the need for the amendments. The revised text of the Memorandum, for instance, seemed to be incompatible with the position of member States as stated in the Constitution and he therefore fully supported the views expressed on the subject by the representative of the Government of Pakistan.

Mr. Tudor (Government, Romania), whose Government was not represented on the Committee, felt that the golden rule for the Governing Body to follow was to abide by the existing rules, at least until the Working Party on Structure proposed a coherent set of amendments.

He could not approve the revised text of the Memorandum since it did not fit the requirements of different national situations. He could, however, agree to communicating the draft to governments and so giving them an opportunity to state their views at the forthcoming Conference session. The Memorandum could then be adopted by a Conference decision. In any event, it would be sensible to submit the draft to governments before referring it to the Governing Body.

With regard to the revision of the Standing Orders concerning the procedure for the examination of representations, articles 4 and 5 of the draft meant that the government against which a representation was made would be at a disadvantage in relation to the organisation which made it. Furthermore, the French text of article 8 suggested that the Governing Body would publish the representation but would exercise discretion in deciding whether to publish any statement received in reply. Here again, the government was at a disadvantage. Finally, the draft made no provision for action to prevent leaks of the kind that had enabled the press and other media on past occasions to make use of evidence in files that ought to have been kept confidential. It was only right to require those who made representations to undertake to abide by ILO procedures and to behave with discretion pending the Organisation's decision.

Papers dealing with such important matters as that being discussed should be distributed soon enough in advance for Government representatives to have time to
consult the authorities at home and be able to state a final opinion. The speaker, who had received the Committee's report only a few hours beforehand, had no alternative but to reserve his Government's position.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) pointed out that the Committee's report had been available for some time while the papers prepared for the Committee had come out several weeks earlier and so there had been no difficulty for anyone to get hold of them. The process of examination had been anything but hasty; indeed it had been long and arduous, and Committee members had been relieved to get through their work at last.

When a committee was as large as the Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, it was obviously not easy to satisfy everyone, particularly when it was a matter of drafting rules. It did appear, however, that the Committee had done its work well and managed to propose satisfactory solutions. Besides, all that was intended was to put them to the test - for example, the time limit on speeches in plenary sitting at the Conference - and the Governing Body could always change them if they proved unworkable.

The Chairman asked the representative of the Director-General to clarify certain points.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Lagergren, Deputy Chief of the International Labour Standards Department), referring to the question of the nature of the Memorandum concerning the submission of Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities, confirmed that the only text laying down obligations in that regard was the Constitution of the ILO. As the proposed new text actually stated, the Memorandum did not impose any obligations on member States over and above those laid down in the Constitution; its purpose was to help governments in fulfilling their constitutional obligations with respect to the submission of Conventions and Recommendations.

Mr. Tudor had asked why the revision of the Memorandum had been undertaken, and whether it would not be wise to consult all the Members of the Organisation on the proposed new text; that, in fact, was what had actually been done. Year after year the Conference Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations spent a great deal of time considering how far member States were fulfilling their constitutional obligation to submit Conventions and Recommendations to the competent authorities. It was the Conference Committee which had wanted the Governing Body to help governments by bringing the text up to date after a lapse of over 20 years, and that proposal had been endorsed by the Conference.

Mr. Tudor had also asked questions about articles 4 and 5 of the draft Standing Orders concerning the procedure for the examination of representations and expressed the view that, as regards the right to be heard by the committee set up to examine the representation, the organisation making it and the government concerned were not on a par. As was recorded in paragraph 43 of the report, however, the Committee on Standing Orders had agreed at the Governing Body's last session to a proviso to the effect that the government might request the committee set up to examine the representation to hear one of its representatives. The Committee had approved that provision unanimously. At the present session the Worker members of the Committee had asked that the same right should be granted also to the organisation making the representation, and the Committee had agreed, its aim being indeed to guarantee equal rights to both parties.

Mr. Tudor (Government, Pomania) thanked the representative of the Director-General for the information supplied but maintained that the draft of the revised Memorandum should be communicated to those who had asked for its revision, namely the member States assembled at the Conference.

As for articles 4 and 5 of the Standing Orders concerning the procedure for the examination of representations, the organisation making the representation and the government could not be regarded as being on a par since the committee set up to examine the representation could, proprio motu, summon a representative of the organisation to give evidence before it, whereas the government had to ask the committee to hear its representative and even then was not sure that its request would be granted. In the circumstances his Government maintained its reservations.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 12, 19, 24, 27, 34 and 47 of the report.
FIFTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the International Organisations Committee

Mr. Mehta (Worker, India) said that the Workers' group endorsed the conclusions in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the report, particularly conclusions (c) and (e) in paragraph 3.

The Workers' views on the new international development strategy were recorded in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the report.

As regards migrant workers, the group's position was set out in paragraph 15. It would have been preferable to leave responsibility for the problems of migrant workers with the ILO, since there was a risk of overlapping and duplication of work if the United Nations took upon itself to draft an international Convention on the subject instead of confining itself to general questions affecting all foreigners.

As regards the comprehensive policy review of operational activities, the Workers felt that funds for development should be available on a predictable, continuous and assured basis and for that purpose they advocated introducing a form of international tax of the kind proposed in the Brandt Commission's "North-South" report. They also hoped that the 1979 Conference resolution on technical co-operation would not be lost sight of.

On the question of assistance to national liberation movements, they felt that aid should be increased, provided the resources were available.

The Workers were disappointed to see that so few delegations at the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development had included representatives of organisations of rural workers and small farmers. They were pleased, however, to note that the programme of action adopted by that Conference referred to freedom of association and rural workers' organisations. Agrarian reform was vital to economic and social progress.

The Workers would like to be given more detailed information later in a paper on the role the ILO could play and the action it could take to give effect to the decisions of the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development.

They were pleased with the agreement reached at the Thematic Joint Programming Meeting on the Working Environment, which gave the ILO a leading role in endeavours to improve the working environment. An effort should be made to check the proliferation of organisations in the United Nations system, particularly when there was already a competent agency - as the ILO was for labour questions. The Workers accepted the recommendations in paragraphs 53 and 55 of the report.

As regards disarmament, the Workers were of course convinced that economic and social progress depended on stopping the armaments race and the ruinous expenditure on weapons of destruction, now estimated at a million dollars a minute. Some doubts had been expressed about the ILO's competence in this field, but the Organisation could play a useful part, for instance by studying the conversion of armaments industries to peaceful purposes.

Mr. Tata (Employer, India) said that the Employers' group approved most of the Committee's recommendations. Despite the clarifications given by the representative of the Director-General, Mr. Bolin, however, they still had reservations on some points, and they hoped that Mr. Bolin would bear them in mind when representing the ILO in United Nations bodies.

These concerned, in the first place, the Director-General's proposals for points to be covered in the new international development strategy, a subject on which the Employers' views were summarised in paragraph 8 of the report. Full productive employment by the year 2000 was not an attainable goal and the ILO should not subscribe to it without expressing some reservations in view of the unpredictable impact of population growth on employment. Unduly idealistic assertions damaged the credibility of United Nations documents, as had been amply demonstrated during the three United Nations Development Decades.
As to the General Assembly's decision to draft an international Convention on migrant workers, the Employers considered that the United Nations text should supplement, and deal only with matters not covered by, the ILO Convention. The ILO should resist any encroachment by other institutions in areas of direct ILO concern.

Paragraph 57 of the report recorded the Employers' firm support for disarmament as such. Unfortunately the ILO could do very little to check the arms race, and it was doubtful whether plaus hopes and the resolutions it had adopted over the past 15 years, and which had had no practical effect, were not actually counterproductive. Such resolutions would serve a purpose only when the world political climate changed.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) regarded the Convention on migrant workers which the General Assembly proposed to adopt as an intervention in the ILO's field of competence, all the more incomprehensible because the United Nations might be expected to see to it that the standards adopted by the various organisations neither contradicted each other nor overlapped.

It could be imagined what difficulties would arise if, for example, the United Nations instrument were to be based on a restrictive definition of the migrant worker whereby its provisions would not cover all foreign workers. Resolution No. XXXIV/172, adopted in a supposedly neutral and non-committal spirit, since it went beyond the mere protection of the migrant as a worker and sought to protect him also against racial, religious or cultural discrimination; but that in fact was where the danger lay - the danger that foreigners not included in the migrant worker category might not enjoy protection against such forms of discrimination.

Defending the competence of the ILO in this case was not merely being parochial: it was important that an instrument designed in good faith to protect a large category of migrant workers should not have a "boomerang" effect on other foreigners. If the United Nations felt it desirable to adopt a Convention on the subject, it should at least make a point of including all foreign workers within its scope, having regard also to the scope of ILO standards, and avoid establishing within the United Nations framework a system of protection which would vary depending on the group of foreign workers concerned.

On the other hand, perhaps the United Nations might be invited to adopt measures of a kind that had never yet been considered, namely action to protect the basic right of migrant workers: the right to emigrate. Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stated the right of every human being to leave any country, including his own, and to return to it. That right was not always respected in practice and the United Nations would be better engaged in trying to achieve progress in this area.

The programme of action described in the section of the report dealing with the UNEP Thematic Joint Programming Meeting on the Working Environment was excellent. In this instance the whole United Nations family had recognised the ILO's primary responsibility for the improvement of the working environment. The Organisation's approach, however, should not be confined to problems arising at the workplace but should cover those linked to the environment as a whole, whose impact on the lives of workers was at least as important as that of inflation, for instance, and the erosion of wages.

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) pointed out that paragraph 3(e) of the section of the report on the role and place of the ILO in the restructured United Nations system proposed that the ILO should be represented by tripartite Governing Body delegations at meetings of the United Nations or of other United Nations institutions. This recommendation would presumably entail additional expenditure. It was important, in any event, that such delegations should not consist of just three members, as for Industrial Committees or regional meetings, but should include nationals of both the developing and the advanced countries.

The inclusion of social objectives in the new international development strategy should not be allowed to shift the strategy's emphasis away from the main objective, which was to restructure international economic relations. That point of view should be reflected in the ILO communication to be addressed to the United Nations.

The General Assembly's intention to prepare a Convention on migrant workers was cause for satisfaction. A United Nations Convention would carry much more
weight with member States. As for ILO action, it should aim at ensuring that the essential provisions of its own instruments were incorporated in the United Nations text.

With regard to the comprehensive policy review of operational activities of the United Nations system, the Government of Pakistan eagerly awaited the report of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation. It did not agree, however, that the new strategy should go into as much detail as was proposed in subparagraphs (e) and (f) of paragraph 32. Finally, it agreed that the ILO should continue to give assistance to national liberation movements and recommended developing this highly useful programme further.

Héctor González Martínez (Government, Mexico) pointed out that the proposed United Nations Convention for the protection of workers and their families did not in any way infringe upon the competence of the ILO.

The United Nations - that most universal world body - had far greater scope for action with respect to human rights, and what was at stake was all the rights of migrant workers, not just their rights as workers. The protection envisaged would also cover all those working abroad, for whatever reason, as well as their families. Such a vast undertaking clearly was beyond the sole competence of the ILO.

In any event, General Assembly Resolution XXXIV/172 specifically requested the international organisations concerned to cooperate with the working party set up to draft the Convention, and the ILO would thus have an opportunity to play its proper role, since the United Nations would surely need to make use of its knowledge and experience as well as of the legal bases provided by the existing international labour standards on the subject.

Héctor Falcetti (Government, Uruguay), though he had shared the concern expressed about the need to respect the competence of the specialised agencies was reassured by Héctor González Martínez's statement, from which it was clear that the ILO's competence in the matter, stated in article 57 of the United Nations Charter, would not be forgotten, and there would be no duplication of effort or waste of resources - something the international community should try to avoid.

Héctor Noack (Government, German Democratic Republic) welcomed the information given to the Committee by the representative of the Director-General, Héctor Bolin, on proposals for ILO assistance to the independent State of Zimbabwe. Relations between the Organisation and the liberation movement would thus continue at a higher level.

Héctor Zenger (Government, Switzerland) supported the views expressed by Héctor Falcetti, from which it was clear that for the United Nations to draft an international Convention on migrant workers was a particularly serious case of overlapping. Quite apart from the question of ILO competence, the broad interests of migrant workers themselves were at stake. In keeping with the views expressed in the Committee by the Swiss Government, as summarised in paragraph 19 of the report, it was important to keep a close watch on the work of the General Assembly's working group, in which the ILO should be represented by a tripartite Governing Body delegation.

Héctor Aziz Parag (Observer, Organisation of African Unity) expressed the OAU's warm thanks to the ILO for taking such a keen interest in the question of assistance to national liberation movements. The funds for providing such assistance came from various sources, such as the UNDP, the United Nations Council for Namibia, bilateral programmes and the ILO's regular budget. It would be highly desirable for the Organisation to increase its aid in two fields: vocational training - particularly through the Turin Centre - and workers' education.

It had been gratifying to hear Héctor Bolin state that the ILO intended to have even closer relations with national liberation movements in future. It would be desirable to submit a paper to the International Organisations Committee taking stock of assistance to such movements.

Héctor Hacha (Worker, Tanzania), after observing that one of the national liberation movements that had received assistance from the ILO was the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe - a State whose people had just acceded to political independence - pointed out that the assistance given so far to liberation movements in general was quite inadequate to the enormous problems still facing them and the peoples they represented. He hoped that such assistance could be substantially increased in the near future.
Replying to the discussion, the representative of the Director-General (Mr. Bolin, Deputy Director-General) said that the conclusions recommended by the International Organisations Committee concerning the role and place of the ILO in the restructured United Nations system were of the utmost importance as the first attempt to define the Organisation's role since the General Assembly had adopted Resolution No. XXXII/197.

He thanked the representative of the Organisation of African Unity for his kind words about ILO assistance to national liberation movements. As Mr. Macha had observed, such assistance had not been very substantial but that was because the programmes were financed mainly from extra-budgetary sources, in particular the UNDP, which, as it happened, had just approved credits of approximately $3.6 million for a vast vocational training project on behalf of SWAPO in Angola.

On the question of migrant workers, what must be done now was to find the best practical approach so as to avoid overlapping of effort. Perhaps it would have been more practical for the General Assembly, before deciding to draw up a comprehensive Convention, to look into other means of solving this serious problem. Now that the General Assembly had taken a decision, however, the Office was firmly committed - a point brought out clearly in the paper submitted to the Committee - to full cooperation with the United Nations in ensuring the best possible co-ordination and preventing any duplication of effort and any conflict between the future Convention and the relevant ILO instruments.

He was sorry that he had failed to convince Mr. Tata on some points relating to the social objectives of the new international development strategy. True, development plans should take population growth into account, but it was not the Office's task to make population projections: in assessing the impact of population growth on employment it used projections made elsewhere. Of the proposals which the Committee had requested the Director-General to submit to the Preparatory Committee for the new international development strategy, those set out in paragraph 32(d) of the report went at least some way towards meeting Mr. Tata's concerns, their aim being the creation of employment at a rate exceeding by a given percentage the net addition to the labour force.

Finally, regarding disarmament, the Director-General's policy had been to seek to determine what contribution the ILO could make, within its own field of competence, to the common endeavours of the United Nations system. For that purpose he was continuing his consultations with the United Nations Centre for Disarmament and with the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. As Mr. Bolin had informed the Committee, the Office expected to be able in due course to submit concrete proposals on the ILO's role in this field for approval by the Governing Body.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 2, 3, 53 and 55 of the report.

SIXTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings

First paper

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman), referring to the Panel of Consultants on Safety in Mines, was surprised that of the six Government consultants only two had so far been nominated, whereas the Worker and Employer nominations had been made long ago. At this rate the Panel would not be reconstituted until its term of office expired, in March 1982. The consultants had a crucial role to play in a branch of industry with a large workforce. Did the Office intend to extend the Panel's term of office or have any specific date in mind for a meeting to enable the consultants to study problems of safety in mines?

As regards the agenda of the Seventh Session of the African Advisory Committee, the Labour Relations (Public Service) Convention, 1978 (No. 151), should be added to the list of instruments which appeared in paragraph 14 of the Office paper and which the Committee would consider under agenda item (b). The Committee should pay due attention to a text which dealt with basic human rights.
Mr. Kysely (Government, Czechoslovakia) wished to know what criteria had been followed in making the nominations to the Tripartite Advisory Panel of Experts on Actuarial Social Security Questions which appeared in paragraph 4 of the paper. Had there been consultations with governments?

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) said in reply to Mr. Morris that unfortunately the consultations on appointments to the Panel of Consultants on Safety in Mines had taken longer than expected. The Office was actively continuing its consultations with four governments and hoped to be able to submit nominations very soon. At the same time it would probably also propose extending the Panel's term of office. Concrete suggestions for a meeting of the consultants would be made in the usual way in the programme and budget proposals for the next biennium. As regards Mr. Morris's second point, Convention No. 151 could be added to the list of instruments to be drawn to the attention of the African Advisory Committee in its review of the ratification and implementation of ILO standards in Africa.

As regards Mr. Kysely's question, the body in question was a very small one - three experts for each of the three sides - and in making the nominations the Office had drawn on its own experience and its contacts with well-known actuaries in the field of social security.

Mr. Gechslin (Employer, France, Employer Vice-Chairman) expressed the Employers' agreement with the agenda proposed for the Seventh Session of the African Advisory Committee and with the addition proposed by the Workers' group.

Like Mr. Morris, he regretted the delay in the submission of Government nominations to panels of consultants. It was interesting for the Employers and Workers to have the names of the Government experts, and it would therefore be preferable if the Office waited until it had a full list which would allow some assessment of the consultants' calibre and geographic distribution instead of putting up two or three names at each session.

It was agreed that the Labour Relations (Public Service) Convention, 1978 (No. 151), should be added to the list of ILO basic human rights Conventions to be examined by the African Advisory Committee under the second item of its agenda.

Mr. Okouaghe (Government, Gabon) expressed the African governments' support for the agenda proposed for the Seventh Session of the African Advisory Committee and also for the proposal that the paper on review and evaluation of ILO activities in Africa to be prepared for the Committee should cover the various aspects of the Medium-Term Plan for 1982-87 which concerned Africa.

The proposals for the agenda of the Sixth African Regional Conference would be considered in consultation with the Labour Commission of the Organisation of African Unity.

Mr. Khalifa (Government, Egypt) supported the agenda proposed for the Seventh Session of the African Advisory Committee. He hoped, however, that the Committee might consider, for the purposes of the agenda of the Sixth African Regional Conference, topics other than those mentioned in the Office paper, especially if linked with resolutions adopted by the Fifth Regional Conference. Account would of course have to be taken of the time needed by the Office for the preparatory work that might entail.

The Governing Body adopted the proposals in paragraphs 4, 8, 23, 25, 27 and 31 of the Office paper.

Second paper

The Governing Body adopted the proposals in paragraph 8 of the Office paper.
SEVENTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Symposia, seminars and assimilated meetings

The Governing Body took note of the Office paper.

EIGHTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General (concl.)

Mr. Khan (Government, Pakistan) and Mr. Ahmed (Worker, Pakistan), referring to the obituary section of the report, expressed their deep sorrow at the death of Mr. Hafiz Abdul Majid, who had served the Organisation with distinction and dedication as Assistant Director-General.

The Director-General associated the Office with the tributes paid to the memory of a senior official who had been both his colleague and his friend. The news of Mr. Majid's death had caused great sadness in Geneva.

Mr. Cechelin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) associated the Employers' group with the tributes to Mr. Majid.

Mr. Kostine (Government, USSR) reminded the Governing Body that Professor L.A. Lunz had been an international lawyer of world renown whom many officials of the Office had had a chance to work with from 1965 to 1974, when he was a member of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. The speaker associated himself with the condolences the Director-General would be conveying to Mr. Lunz's family.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 6 and 11 of the report.

First Supplementary Report

Code of Practice on Occupational Exposure to Airborne Substances Harmful to Health

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

Second Supplementary Report

Participation of non-governmental international organisations in the 66th Session (1980) of the Conference

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

1 See seventh sitting.
Third Supplementary Report

Second Report of the Officers of the Governing Body: Composition of Industrial and analogous Committees

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

Fourth Supplementary Report

First Report of the Officers of the Governing Body

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 6 and 15 of the report.

Replying to a question from Miss Silva y Silva (Government, Peru), the representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) said that none of the countries in the American region invited to participate in the Second Tripartite Technical Meeting for the Clothing Industry, which was to be held in Geneva from 23 September to 2 October 1980, had declined the invitation. The Director-General had therefore not needed to draw on the reserve list for the American region, which included Peru.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), referring to paragraph 8(a) of the report, asked whether in selecting the "recognised experts" mentioned there the Office would carry out tripartite consultations.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) explained that the experts referred to were well-known specialists in their field whom the Office from time to time consulted by letter on specific matters. The Office would of course welcome any proposals from the Employer or Worker members regarding people who were eminent in the field in question and might be included in its consultation network.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 22 and 25 of the report.

Mr. Lee (Employer, Malaysia), speaking as a member of the Council of one of the organisations affiliated to the ASEAN Confederation of Employers, thanked the Governing Body for the decision it had just taken to grant regional consultative status to the Confederation.

Mr. Khalifa (Government, Egypt) expressed his Government's reservations concerning the recommendation in paragraph 29 of the report that the Director-General should be authorised to invite the Arab Federation of Oil, Mining and Chemical Workers' Trade Unions (Tripoli) to be represented at the Ninth Session of the Petroleum Committee. His reasons had already been explained at the last session, both in the Governing Body and in the Industrial Activities Committee.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 29 of the report.

Fifth Supplementary Report

Participation of non-metropolitan territories as observers in the 66th Session (1980) of the International Labour Conference

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 3 of the report.
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Third Report of the Officers of the Governing Body

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) confirmed the Workers’ unanimous support for the request of the Organisation of African Trade Union Unity (OATUU) to be granted full consultative status. The Workers looked forward to close association of the OATUU in the work of the Organisation. It should be understood, however, that this was an ad hoc decision based solely on the special circumstances of the case.

Mr. M’Polo (Government, Angola) said that the African governments fully supported the OATUU request for full consultative status. He was convinced that the OATUU would become a reliable partner for the ILO and that its contribution in dealing with the problems of African workers would be a useful one. The grant of full consultative status to such a major organisation as the OATUU was viewed by the African countries as a most encouraging development.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 4 and 6 of the report.

NINTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Programme of meetings

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) asked whether the Committee to Consider Reports on the Effect Given to the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy might not be scheduled to complete its work by Friday, 26 September instead of Saturday, 27 September, as proposed.

It was so agreed.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) wondered whether, in case the Working Party on Structure had to meet just before the 66th Session of the Conference, there was not a danger of conflict between that meeting and the Tripartite Meeting of Governing Body Members on Apartheid, which it was proposed should be held from Thursday, 22 May to Monday, 26 May. Many of the Governing Body members who would be taking part in the meeting on apartheid were also members of the Working Party on Structure.

Mr. Mainswaring (Government, Canada), in Miss González Martínez's absence, said that he had already raised that question in the Government group, which had made sure that the governments nominated would be able to attend both meetings.

Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) pointed out that, unlike members of the other two groups, governments could be represented by different persons in meetings held concurrently. He therefore associated himself with Mr. Morris’s position.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) said, with reference to Mr. Mainswaring’s remarks, that he had refrained from intervening in the discussion on behalf of Miss González Martínez, Chairman of the Government group, who had asked him to represent her in the Governing Body, because he had foreseen the objection from the Employer and Worker members.

The Director-General suggested that even if the Working Party on Structure did not succeed in completing its work in March the two meetings might nevertheless be held during the same period, subject to an appropriate adaptation of their timetables.

Replying to Mr. Morris, he explained that the purpose of scheduling the meeting on apartheid from Thursday, 22 May to Monday, 26 May was to provide a weekend for the preparation of the meeting’s report.
Mr. Oechslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman), supported by Miss Dieguez Armas (Government, Mexico), felt that the Working Party on Structure should itself propose dates for its second meeting, if required, on the understanding that, as suggested in paragraph 3 of the Office paper, the decision would be taken by the Officers of the Governing Body, two of whom at least would be in Geneva for the Working Party's first meeting.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 3, 5 and 13 of the Office paper.

TWENTIETH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Appointment of Governing Body representatives on various bodies

On the nomination of the respective groups, the Governing Body appointed the following of its members to participate in the Tripartite Meeting of Governing Body Members on Apartheid:

**Government group:** Angola  
Egypt  
German Democratic Republic  
Guyana  
India  
Italy  
Nigeria  
Zambia

**Employers' group:** Mr. Appadurai  
Mr. Chambers  
Mr. Coates (personal substitute: Mr. Healy)  
Mr. Georget  
Miss Hak  
Mr. Moukoko Kingue  
Mr. Ola  
Mr. Sumbwe (personal substitute: Mr. Owuor)

**Substitutes:** Mr. Richan  
Mr. Verschueren

**Workers' group:** Mr. Barnabo  
Mr. Lloyd  
Mr. Macha  
Mr. Mehta  
Mr. Morris  
Mr. Pimenov  
Mr. Walcott  
Mr. Ziesba

**Substitutes:** Mr. González Navarro  
Mr. Hawke  
Mr. Issifu  
Mr. Konate

On the nomination of the Workers' group, the Governing Body appointed the following of its members to the Tripartite Governing Body delegations to the meetings indicated:
Determination of the Members of the Organisation of Chief Industrial Importance (concl.)

Miss Dieguez Armas (Government, Mexico), referring to the new Office paper containing proposals for the appointment of a committee of experts, reminded the Governing Body that the last occasion on which such a committee had reported to it had been its 208th Session (November 1978).

That committee had pointed out that the expression "Members of chief industrial importance" seemed out of date and had made a number of recommendations for modernising the criteria applied. In the circumstances the Mexican Government considered that the next committee of experts should be asked to update the criteria as well as the weights used so that the Governing Body would have more realistic data on which to take its decision.

To take but one example, the experts who had carried out the 1968 review of the list of Members of chief industrial importance had applied a criterion dating from 1934 under which 50 per cent of the estimated number of women employed in agriculture were left out of the calculations. It was important to know on what basis it had been decided to leave out of account such a large component of the workforce. The 1968 committee, incidentally, had expressly stated that use of the total labour force statistics would not alter the list of countries. Was it, then, realistic in 1980 to apply criteria established 46 years ago, when the stage of development of member States and the level of technical progress in agriculture were quite different?

Moreover, recent international labour standards reflected ILO recognition of the importance of the female workforce in agriculture, and it would be advisable to change the weights used accordingly.

Mr. Goehslin (Employer, France; Employer Vice-Chairman) said that the Employers' group approved the list of experts proposed in the Office paper.

Referring to the points made by Miss Dieguez Armas, he pointed out that under article 13 of its Standing Orders, which was based on Article 7(3) of the Constitution, the Governing Body was required to take the advice of a committee of experts, but not to give it advice. It would be time enough when the Governing Body had before it the conclusions submitted by the experts - high-level specialists from different countries - to discuss, criticise, reject or accept their recommendations. For the time being it was simply a matter of appointing them.

Mr. Jiménez de Parga (Government, Spain) expressed deep surprise at the proposals regarding the composition of the committee: of the six candidates proposed, three had been members of the committee of experts that had advised the

---

1 See first sitting.
Governing Body in November 1978. His Government had already expressed the view at the time that the four experts appointed on that occasion had not taken the right approach, since they had identified the ten countries of "chief economic importance" rather than of "chief industrial importance", as provided for in both the Constitution and the Standing Orders of the Governing Body. At the first sitting of the present session he had once again stressed the need for strict observance of the provisions of the existing Constitution, and that meant in particular, in this case, that even desirable reforms of the type proposed by the Mexican Government representative ought not to be entertained.

Even though the competence and impartiality of the eminent persons proposed were beyond question, and even though the Governing Body might feel that there were no other people in the world who were even more competent, the manner in which the selection was made gave cause for surprise.

Mr. Morris (Worker, Canada; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed his group's support for the nominations proposed. He agreed with Mr. Oechslin: the Governing Body had to appoint a committee whose advice on the list of ten countries would go to the Officers of the Governing Body and, through them, to the Governing Body itself. It was not for the Governing Body to tell the committee how it should do its work.

Mr. Saboia (Government, Brazil) supported the proposals before the Governing Body, which were in line with the provisions of both the Constitution and the Standing Orders of the Governing Body. As the representative of the Government of Brazil, which the Committee of Experts and the Governing Body in 1978 had included in the list of States of chief industrial importance, he had not intended to take part in the debate; however, in view of the statements made by the Spanish Government representative he felt bound to say that he could not accept the latter's challenge to the perfectly regular procedure through which his country had been designated.

It was surprising that Mr. Jiménez de Parga should question the interpretation which recent committees of experts had placed on the term "chief industrial importance". The various reviews of ILO programmes had highlighted the growing emphasis placed by the ILO on such matters as rural development and the informal urban sector. Since giving preferential treatment to industrial activity meant improving the rich countries' chances for designation, the interpretation chosen by recent expert committees should be upheld.

Mr. Mainwaring (Government, Canada) pointed out that, if the current debate on structure was successful, as was to be hoped, this would perhaps be the last occasion for identifying States of chief industrial importance.

He had been somewhat concerned over the report of the last committee of experts and he hoped that the new committee would perform its work with full attention both to ILO constitutional requirements, even if they might seem a little out of date, and to reasonably applicable precedents.

He was confident that the committee of experts would act impartially and give the Officers of the Governing Body and the Governing Body itself a basis on which to make a fair decision in May.

Miss Dieguez Armas (Government, Mexico) had not meant to suggest that the Governing Body should now consider criteria or give instructions to the Committee of Experts. She had simply wished to remind the Governing Body that the 1978 committee had recommended review of the criteria. In so doing it had acted in full conformity with the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, article 13(2) of which provided for it to "advise on the most appropriate criteria of industrial importance". She failed to see, therefore, what prevented the Governing Body from expressing a wish that the committee should on this occasion review its criteria and the weights used in the past so that the Governing Body's decision might be based on up-to-date facts.

The Governing Body adopted the proposals in paragraph 4 of the Office paper.

The session was declared closed at 7.35 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Government representative - representante gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Employer member - miembro empleador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Worker member - miembro trabajador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Government substitute - suplente gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Employer substitute - suplente empleador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCT</td>
<td>Government adviser - consejero técnico gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECT</td>
<td>Employer adviser - consejero técnico empleador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>Worker adviser - consejero técnico trabajador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Government representative (deputy member) - representante gubernamental (miembro adjunto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Employer deputy member - miembro empleador adjunto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Worker deputy member - miembro trabajador adjunto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>Government substitute (deputy member) - suplente gubernamental (miembro adjunto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACT</td>
<td>Government adviser (deputy member) - consejero técnico gubernamental (miembro adjunto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACT</td>
<td>Employer adviser (deputy member) - consejero técnico empleador (miembro adjunto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACT</td>
<td>Worker adviser (deputy member) - consejero técnico trabajador (miembro adjunto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNH</td>
<td>Representative of a non-Member Government - representante de un gobierno no Miembro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>Representative of an international governmental organisation - representante de una organización internacional gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONG</td>
<td>Representative of an international non-governmental organisation - representante de una organización internacional no gubernamental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GS ABOU ASSI, Nagi M., conseiller, représentant permanent adjoint du Liban à Genève, (Liban).

TA AGUERIANO, José, Sr. (España), Unión General de Trabajadores.

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

GAS AJAI, O.A., Mr., Assistant Director, Federal Ministry of Employment, Labour and Productivity, (Nigeria).

OI AKBEIL, S., Mr., Permanent Representative in Geneva, (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations).

GCT AKPOPOV, A.G., M., conseiller principal, Division des organisations économiques internationales du ministère des Affaires étrangères de l'URSS, (URSS).

TA AKSEL, Kutay, M. (Turquie), conseiller auprès de la présidence, Confédération des syndicats des travailleurs.

GCT ALBALATE LAPITA, Joaquin, Sr., agregado laboral en la Embajada de España ante le OIT, (España).

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

OI AL-TAGHLABI, Talat, M., chef, Délégation permanente de l'OAT à Genève, (Organisation arabe du travail).

GNN ANDERSEN, Niels Ole, Mr., Head of Division, International Relations Division, Ministry of Labour, (Denmark).

GACT ANDREA d', Guelfo, Sr. (Uruguay).

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

EA ARBESSER-RASTBURG, M., Mr. (Austria), Chief of Personnel, Brevillier-Urban AG.

EA ASFOUR, Salid, Mr. (Jordan), President, Amman Chamber of Industry.

TA BANCHI, Ramón A., Sr. (Argentina), Federación de Obreros y Empleados de Telecomunicaciones.

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

TA BARDABO, Nangbog, M. (Togo), secrétaire général, Confédération nationale des travailleurs du Togo (CNTT).

GCT BARRERO, Juan Antonio, Sr., premier secrétaire, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra, (Colombia).

GNN BARRONI, Joel, R.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Israel in Geneva, (Israel).

GCT BATES, W.H., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva, (United Kingdom).

GNN BATIUK, Victor G., M., représentant permanent de la RSS d'Ukraine à Genève, (RSS d'Ukraine).

GS BEL HAJJ HASSINE, Sadok, M., chef du bureau de la coopération internationale, ministère des Affaires sociales; représentant du gouvernement de la Tunisie au Conseil d'administration, (Tunisie).

GCT BEN AMOR, Halima, Mme, chargée de mission, Mission permanente de la Tunisie à Genève, (Tunisie).

TA BEN-ISRAEL, G., Mr. (Israel), Member of the Executive Bureau, Histadrut (Federation of Labour in Israel).
BBRES, Andrés, M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente de la République populaire hongroise à Genève, (Hongrie).

BLANKENSTEIN van, J.R., Mr., Deputy Head, International Social Affairs Division, Ministry of Social Affairs, (Netherlands).


DE BOCK, J., M., Attaché, Mission permanente de la Belgique à Genève, (Belgique).

BOGNAR, Ferenc, Hr., in charge of ILO Affairs; accompanying Mr. Timmer.

BOONY, Jean-Pierre, M., directeur, Office fédéral de l'industrie, des arts et métiers et du travail; représentant du gouvernement de la Suisse au Conseil d'administration, (Suisse).

BOONY, Paulette, Mme, assistante du secrétaire général, (Organisation internationale des employeurs).

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

BOUG, Saviour F., Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Malta in Geneva, (Malta).

BOY, Juma, Mr. (Kenya), HP, Secretary General, Central Organisation of Trade Unions.

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

BRILLANTES, Hortencio J., H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of the Philippines in Geneva, (Philippines).

BRUNAS, Odd, Mr., Senior Counsellor, International Relations Division, Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, (Norway).

BRUGERE, Alain, M., conseiller des affaires étrangères, Direction des Nations Unies et des organisations internationales, ministère des Affaires étrangères, (France).

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

CABREIRA, Clever F., Sr., (Uruguay).

CANO de SANTAYANA y BATES, Antonio, Sr., Subdirector general de Asuntos Sociales Internacionales, Ministerio de Trabajo, (España).

CARON, L., Mme, directeur, Relations internationales, ministère du Travail, (Canada).

CARTIER, Jean-Louis, M., administrateur civil, Division des relations internationales, ministère du Travail et de la Participation, (France).

CASTELLANO SABATER, Vicente, Sr. (España), Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales.

CENTOLA, José A., Sr., Coordinator General de Asuntos Jurídicos del Ministerio de Trabajo, (Argentina).

CHAMEEES, Sidney Beresford, Mr. (Jamaica), OBE, President, Jamaica Employers' Federation.

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

CHIOLA de PIRIZ PACHECO, Angela, Sra., Directora nacional del trabajo, (Uruguay).

CHRISTENSEN, Hans Flamand, Mr., Assistant Head of Division, International Relations Division, Ministry of Labour, (Denmark).
COATES, John Arthur Gordon, Mr. (United Kingdom), DFC, Chairman, International Labour Committee, Confederation of British Industry.

CONDOMINES PEREIRA, Francisco, Sr., Ministro consejero, Embajada de España ante la OIT, (España).

CORNELL, Erik, Mr., Minister, Permanent Mission of Sweden in Geneva, (Sweden).

DACKEVEITCH, Mikhail, M., deuxième secrétaire, Mission permanente de la RSS d'Ukraine à Genève, (RSS d'Ukraine).

DALL, Stina, Hrs., Swedish Employers' Confederation; accompanying Mr. von Holten.

DAMEN, Edward, M, (Confédération mondiale du travail).

DAS, A.S., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India in Geneva, (India).

DAVID, Vethamuthu, Mr. (Malaysia), MP, General-Secretary, Malaysian Trades Union Congress.


DEBONO, Lino Cilia, Mr., Assistant Head, Department of Labour and Emigration, (Malta).

DEGABRIELE, Alfred, Mr., Administrative Officer, Ministry of Labour, Culture and Welfare; substitute representative of the Government of Malta on the Governing Body, (Malta).

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

DESAI, Niranjan, Hr., Chief, External Relations Section, European Office, (United Nations).

DEJUEZ ARMAS, Margarita, Srta., Directora General de Asuntos Internacionales, Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social, (México).

DJEMALLI, Mustapha, Mr., Permanent Mission in Geneva, (League of Arab States).

DJaERMAKOU, A., Mr., External Relations and Inter-Agency Affairs, Office of the Director-General, United Nations Office in Geneva, (United Nations).


EL-FAZAA, Abdeljelil, M., secrétaire, Mission permanente de la Tunisie à Genève, (Tunisie).

EL-SHAFEI, Omar, H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva, (Egypt).

EMAMI, Mahmoud, M., conseiller spécial auprès du ministre; directeur du Bureau des relations internationales, ministère du Travail et des Affaires sociales, représentant du gouvernement de la République islamique de l'Iran au Conseil d'administration, (Iran).

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

ESSY, Amara, S.E., Ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la République de Côte d'Ivoire à Genève, (Côte d'Ivoire).

FAREKIAN, Murat, Sr. (Argentina), Unión Industrial Argentina (UIA).

FALCHETTI MIGNONE, Roberto, Sr., profesor de la Cátedra de Derecho del Trabajo, Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales; representante del Gobierno de Uruguay ante el Consejo de Administración, (Uruguay).
FALCHI, Giovanni, S.E., Ambassadeur; représentant du gouvernement de l'Italie au Conseil d'administration, (Italie).

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

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

FERREDO, Morella, Sra., tercer secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra, (Venezuela).

FLEAULT, D., Dr., Chief Medical Officer, Health Team Development, Division of Health Manpower Development, (World Health Organization).

FODA, Mohamed, Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva, (Egypt).

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).


FREDRIKSSON, Ulla, Ms., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Sweden in Geneva, (Sweden).

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

FUJISAWA, Ikuko, Miss, International Department, Japanese Federation of Chemical and General Workers Unions; accompanying Mr. Tanaka.

GARCIA, J.L.B., Mr., Assistant Secretary, Department of Employment, (United Kingdom).

GARCIA TEJEDOR, Electo José, Sr., Director General de Organizaciones y Conferencias Internacionales, Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores, (España).

GAUDREAU, J., M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente du Canada à Genève, (Canada).

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

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

GEORGET, Henri, M. (Niger), entrepreneur.


GODOY ARCAIA, Oscar, Mr., Permanent Observer in Geneva, (Organization of American States).

GONZALEZ MARTINEZ, Aída, S.E., Embajadora; Official Mayor, Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores; representante del Gobierno de México ante el Consejo de Administración, (México).

GONZALEZ NAVARRO, J., Sr. (Venezuela), Confederación de Trabajadores de Venezuela.

GRAY, Mary, Ms., International Department, Trades Union Congress; accompanying Mr. Lloyd.

GRUBER, Hans, Mr., Member, State Secretariat for Labour and Wages, (German Democratic Republic).

GUERRA, José, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra, (Colombia).

GUIDOBONO, Pabón H., Sr., Asesor Técnico Legal del Departamento de Asuntos Internacionales del Ministerio de Trabajo, (Argentina).

E HABIB, H. EL-M., Mr. (Egypt), Chairman, Federation of Egyptian Industries.

EA HAFEZ, Ibrahim, Mr. (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), President, Libyan Employers' Association.


FA HAJ, Cornelia, Miss (Netherlands), Chief, International Social Affairs Department, Federation of Netherlands Industry; accompanying Mr. Verschueren.

OI HAMLSCH, Claire, Miss, Inter-Agency Co-ordinator, (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

GS HANDLEE, Kurt, Mr., Head, ILO Affairs Division, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, (Federal Republic of Germany).

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

GCT HAYASHIDA, Hideki, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva, (Japan).

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

GACT HECKEL, Reiner, Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of the German Democratic Republic in Geneva, (German Democratic Republic).

GACT HÉGUY TERRA, Eduardo, Sr., Director Nacional de Recursos Humanos del Ministerio de Trabajo; Profesor Investigador de la Universidad; representante suplente del Gobierno de Uruguay ante el Consejo de Administración, (Uruguay).

SCT HEINZEMANN, B., Mr., Confederation of German Employers' Associations; accompanying Mr. Lindner.

GHN HERNANDEZ, Homero L., S.E., Embajador; Representante Permanente de la República Dominicana en Ginebra, (República Dominicana).

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

OI HILAL, Amira, Mme, Délégation permanente de l'OAT à Genève, (Organisation arabe du travail).

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

FA HOLTEN von, Johan, Mr. (Sweden), Director, Swedish Employers' Confederation.

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

GACT ICAZA de, Carlos, Sr., Consejero, Misión Permanente de México en Ginebra; representante suplente del Gobierno de México ante el Consejo de Administración, (México).

OI IDOUX, Maurice, Mr., Interregional Training Adviser, European Office, (United Nations).

GS IRASIKU, L.M., Mr., Labour Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Social Services, (Zambia).

GCT INCISA DI CAMERANA, Manfredo, M., conseiller, Mission permanente de l'Italie à Genève, (Italie).

GS IONESCU, Ovidiu, M., conseiller, Mission permanente de la République socialiste de Roumanie à Genève, (Roumanie).

GA ISACSSON, Bert, Mr., Head of Department, Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of Sweden on the Governing Body, (Sweden).
S ISHIKAWA, Mitsukazu, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body, (Japan).

ISSIFU, A.M., Mr. (Ghana), Secretary General, Ghana Trades Union Congress.

JARAMILLO, Felipe, S.E., Embajador, representante permanente adjunto de Colombia en Ginebra, (Colombia).


JIMENEZ de PARGA, Manuel, S.E., Embajador de España ante la OIT; representante del Gobierno de España ante el Consejo de Administración, (España).
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