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MINUTES OF THE 231ST SESSION

The 231st Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office was held in Geneva from 11 November at 3 p.m. to 15 November 1985.
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The following deputy members, or substitute deputy members, were present at all or some of the sittings:
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The following representative of a State Member of the Organisation authorised to take part in the deliberations of the Governing Body in accordance with the decisions taken by the Governing Body at its 229th Session (February-March 1985) was present:

Uruguay: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

The following representatives of States Members of the Organisation were present:
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* * *
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Mr. BLANCHARD, Director-General
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FIRST SITTING
(Monday, 11 November 1985, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.15 p.m., with Mr. Oechslin in the Chair.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

The Chairman welcomed the persons present, particularly those attending a Governing Body session for the first time.

TWENTY-SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General

I. Obituary

The Director-General expressed his deep regret on learning of the death of Mr. Jef Rens, former Principal Deputy Director-General of the International Labour Office, who died on 26 September 1985. An outstanding figure in the history of the Organisation, he had won the respect and admiration of all who had known him. Working successively in the automobile, metal and diamond industries, he had through his willingness to learn quickly come to occupy responsible positions in the Belgian labour movement, and had rendered his country invaluable service during the Second World War. From his first encounter with the Organisation in 1938 he had espoused its cause wholeheartedly, and had made a major contribution to the work surrounding the adoption of the Declaration of Philadelphia. As an official of the Office he had always shown a prodigious appetite for work, and in his relations with his colleagues his outstanding personal qualities were always in evidence, for he took a close personal interest in all other officials, offering encouragement and advice where necessary. His personal style was matched by a great love of reading, although his wide knowledge derived not only from books but owed a great deal to his openness and love of dialogue.

In the ILO he had seen great potential to work for social justice in the world, and three major achievements highlighted his brilliant career. First, his exceptional contribution to the work of drafting and securing the adoption of the two most important Conventions dealing with freedom of association: the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87) and the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98). These instruments now formed the basis for the ILO's work in that field, and his efforts to bring about consultations and negotiations to promote their adoption were universally recognised. Secondly, he had been a driving force in the initial development of the ILO's technical co-operation activities. Thirdly, he had maintained a lifelong concern for the more

---

1 See also tenth sitting.
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under-privileged groups of society, and he would remain in the minds of many as the man chiefly responsible for the Andean-Indian Programme.

His life work had been an expression of his belief in social justice and his conviction of the worth of every individual. Civilisation meant for him a universal concern for all human beings, and he saw it reflected in the sufferings of all those who were persecuted for their beliefs. This too was an expression of his exceptional personal qualities, for his concern extended to all those with whom he came into contact. In the days when the Office staff were far fewer in number, he had personally known every official, taking a particular interest in their training and progress. All who had known Jef Rens would remember him well, with fondness and admiration, as a man who had served the Organisation to the very best of his ability. The Governing Body would no doubt wish him to convey its sympathy to the family of Mr. Jef Rens.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed the profound sadness of the Workers' group at the death of Mr. Jef Rens. Mr. Rens had been a strong figure in the history of the Organisation, and had made an exceptional contribution to the development of the ILO, particularly in the critical years that followed the end of the Second World War. During the war he had served with the Belgian Government in exile, and had made an active contribution towards the rebuilding of his country after the war. Entering the Office in 1944 he brought with him considerable experience of labour matters, and in his career with the ILO performed valuable work to develop its technical co-operation and standard-setting activities, particularly in the field of freedom of association and collective bargaining. He had carried out a great many missions to countries which at the time largely neglected trade union rights. The Workers' group would always remember the valuable work of Jef Rens, both within the ILO and in his own country, where he was President of the National Labour Council. The Workers' group had already conveyed its deep sympathy to his family and to the General Federation of Labour of Belgium.

Mr. Kebede (Government, Ethiopia; Government Vice-Chairman), speaking on behalf of the Government group, joined the previous speakers in paying tribute to the memory of Mr. Jef Rens. Having been a champion of workers' rights in his own country and performing valuable work during the Second World War, Mr. Rens had served the ILO for 21 years with great competence and dedication. He was a pioneer in the development of the ILO's technical co-operation programmes, which had come to play such an important part in the ILO's work for developing countries throughout the world. He would be remembered not only in the ILO, but in many different countries. The Government group would always remember him with deep gratitude, and offered its condolences to the family of Mr. Rens.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the Employers' group, also paid tribute to the memory of Mr. Jef Rens. He had been an outstanding official, and during his 20 years with the Office had worked extremely hard to promote its work, particularly in the field of freedom of association. He had played an important part in the adoption of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, and his efforts to advance technical co-operation activities had been greatly appreciated. The Employers were convinced that Mr. Rens had left an indelible mark on the history of the Organisation and had through his work strengthened its activities. They shared the sorrow felt by other members of the Governing Body at the loss of an outstanding individual.
Mr. Crespo Rodas (Government, Bolivia) wished to pay tribute to the memory of Mr. Jef Rens in appreciation of his remarkable work for the American region. His promotion of technical co-operation had helped the ILO to emerge from its more restricted role of a standard-setting agency. Both at headquarters and in the field Mr. Rens had shown an exceptional gift for organisation and a vast store of energy in furthering the ILO's operational activities, and particularly the Andean Indian Programme. That programme had been an enormous undertaking spanning two decades, involving seven governments and ten United Nations agencies, as well as contributions from other governments and employers' and workers' organisations in the United States and Europe. It had sought to help the indigenous populations of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela by the establishment of schools and rural handicrafts workshops, centres of assistance, agricultural co-operatives, experimental farms and studies of the migration of Indian groups from the desolate regions of the Andes to the Amazon basin. In those isolated parts of South America there would still be Indian peoples who remembered this extraordinary man who one day arrived not to exploit them, but to help them and lend them dignity. Among them too his death would be mourned. Jef Rens had been a true citizen of the world, seeing far ahead of his time and communicating to his colleagues the strength of conviction that drove him onward in his faith in the objectives of the ILO. Part of him had always remained and would always remain in the Office, for he always felt tied to it even after his return to his homeland on retirement. His outstanding example would always be remembered in the ILO.

The Chairman stated that his own acquaintance with Mr. Rens during his last few years as Principal Deputy Director-General of the Office had shown him the sincerity of his conviction and his absolute devotion to the work of the Organisation. He had identified himself completely with his work and fully espoused the ILO's cause of social progress. He had extensive experience of industry and was firmly rooted in reality. He had made major contributions in the fields of freedom of association and technical co-operation, and particularly the Andean Indian Programme. In paying tribute to a man of such qualities, the Governing Body was expressing the feelings of all those whose lives had been improved by the devotion of Jef Rens. He therefore called on the Governing Body to observe one minute's silence in his memory.

The Governing Body observed one minute's silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Jef Rens.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 8 of the report.

FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Approval of the minutes of the 230th Session

The Governing Body approved the minutes of its 230th Session.
SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Date, place and agenda of the 73rd (1987) Session of the Conference

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the paper.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), stated that while the Employers' group remained in favour of including three technical items on the Conference agenda, some of their members from developing countries had reiterated the view that it would be preferable for the Conference agenda to include only two technical items so as to ensure that developing countries could fully participate in all the technical committees. This was a valid argument, as standards were more likely to be ratified if they took into account the widest possible range of views. The Employers would also prefer stress to be laid on the revision of existing standards rather than on the elaboration of new standards, although they did not wish to anticipate the findings of the Working Party on Standards.

As regards the choice of items, priority should be given to a general discussion of technical co-operation. This was an extremely complex issue that was of interest both to developing and industrialised countries, and it was time to review the efforts made by the ILO in the past ten years in their overall context so as to provide guidelines for the future, or at least to determine general trends. Second priority should go to the item concerning the night work of women. The Convention on this subject was a typical example of how the protection of a specific category of workers ultimately turned into a handicap, and this was being recognised by an increasing number of countries. The ban on the night work of women reduced their employment opportunities, and measures were necessary to rectify the impediments created by Convention No. 89, although the Employers' group had no preference regarding the form such revision should take.

The third item selected should deal with safety and health in construction. Although the Employers were not normally in favour of adopting sectoral standards, this particular subject was of interest to countries at all stages of development in view of the considerable numbers of workers employed in the construction industry throughout the world and the high accident rate recorded in the sector. The existing Conventions and Recommendations on safety and health problems in construction were out of date and not adapted to modern construction techniques.

As for the other proposals in the Office paper, it seemed that certain subjects were destined to be submitted, and rejected, every year, and it was perhaps time to lend some thought to the idea of eliminating topics that had already been rejected. Something new was needed, and two obvious areas in which proposals would be welcome concerned agricultural workers and the handling of dangerous substances. The Office could perhaps lend consideration to these subjects in future years.

1 See also second and fourth sittings.
Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) agreed with Mr. Lindner that the Governing Body should avoid predetermining the conclusions of the Working Party on International Labour Standards. Considerations relating to the pace or nature of standard-setting activities should therefore not influence the choice of items for the agenda of the 1987 Conference. Some priority seemed already to have been given in practice to the revision of existing Conventions in recent years. In any case the Workers felt that the agreement reached in 1983 on the inclusion of three technical items should be upheld. Nor was it appropriate to discuss whether or not the number of items on the agenda hindered the full participation of the developing countries; consideration should rather be given to finding ways of increasing their participation, such as financing the cost of delegations from the regular budget. Even in the present circumstances, it was regrettable that some delegations at the Conference seemed to show greater interest in items other than those relating to standard-setting.

As regards the choice of items, the Workers' group assigned highest priority to a general discussion of technical co-operation. The reasons given in the Office paper were more than adequate justification for its selection. The general discussion should, however, produce some concrete results, and in particular an attempt should be made to define more precisely the ILO's role in technical co-operation so that the Organisation could concentrate on its own field of competence more effectively and reach valuable agreement with other agencies so as to avoid duplication of effort. An assessment of past activities would make it possible to draw conclusions for the future. Technical co-operation should be carried out on a tripartite basis, and should be accompanied by measures to promote tripartism. Particular attention should be given to this aspect when papers were prepared for the Conference.

Second priority should go to social security and employment. Consideration of this item should focus not only on financial benefits for the unemployed, but also on how social security systems could be used as vehicles to promote employment. Viewed from this angle, the subject was of interest both to the industrialised and the developing countries. In view of the level of world unemployment everything should be done to create new jobs, and it could not therefore be argued that the subject was unsuitable simply because countries did not have the money to finance unemployment benefits: the aim was to help create more jobs for people so that the countries could earn more income.

Finally, third priority should be attached to the subject of safety and health in construction, and on this point he was in full agreement with the Employers' group. The Convention and Recommendation adopted in 1937 did not apply to the techniques used in modern construction, which had given rise to new safety problems. Further information on this subject could be gained from the report of the Meeting of Experts, to be dealt with under the sixth item on the Governing Body's agenda. As regards the night work of women, while it was arguable that Convention No. 89 created difficulties for women seeking employment, in more general terms the problem in question was not that women suffered discrimination, but rather that night work was still practised, for it was harmful to health and disrupted the normal rhythm of all workers' lives. Was health not more valuable than productivity and profitability? The Workers' group approached the subject from an entirely different perspective than the Employers' group, and this would make it practically impossible to secure agreement on the adoption of a revised Convention.
Mr. Kebede (Government, Ethiopia; Government Vice-Chairman), speaking on behalf of the African Government members, agreed that three technical items should be selected. Most important among them was, in their view, the subject of technical co-operation, which was of great interest to developing countries at all stages of development. In the present world economic situation developing countries were unable to cope with the severe social problems they faced, and were making increasing resort to ILO technical co-operation. The last discussion of the subject by the Conference had taken place in 1977, and since then the entire pattern of technical co-operation had changed. It was therefore appropriate to discuss all aspects of the question and to assess the form, content and achievements of technical co-operation in order to identify trends and to determine priorities.

Second priority should be given to safety and health in construction. The increasing number of accidents in that sector was attracting particular attention in developing countries, and this had been emphasised by many Governing Body members at past sessions. Africa faced growing difficulties in the industry, which was at the same time a key area for employment.

Finally, third priority should be given to reconsideration of the question of the night work of women. Some countries saw Convention No. 89 as a means of protection, while others viewed it as a form of discrimination leading to sexual inequality in employment. Moreover, the plan of action with a view to promoting equality of opportunity and treatment for women workers adopted by the Conference in 1975 as well as the resolution adopted by the Conference in 1985 called for measures to review all protective legislation on a periodic basis, so as to determine their validity. An examination of the issue by the Conference would therefore be useful so as to take account of more recent experience.

Mr. Chiba (Government, Japan), speaking on behalf of the Asian Government members, stated that in their view priority should be attached to technical co-operation. They had not, however, reached consensus on the remaining items to be given preference.

Mr. Garcia Garcia (Government, Venezuela) felt that the present situation regarding technical co-operation activities was a cause for concern, and priority should therefore be attached to this item. In particular, Latin American countries had suffered a 4 per cent decrease in its share of overall ILO technical co-operation.

His second choice fell on social security and employment. The theme of unemployment was extremely topical, and all possibilities for job creation should be investigated.

Mr. Dimase (Government, Argentina) thought that the criteria for the selection of items for the Conference agenda should be that they were of sufficient importance; that they were of interest to the greatest possible number of countries; that they should be of great topical relevance; that the preparatory work was sufficiently advanced; and that from that preparatory work some degree of consensus could be detected. Three of the items proposed by the Office met these criteria. These were: technical co-operation, working conditions in hotels, restaurants and similar establishments, and safety and health in construction.

As regards technical co-operation, the present situation was well known. Despite the efforts of the international community, the amount of resources available for technical co-operation was constantly diminishing for
a variety of reasons. This was happening at a time when the ILO had become aware of the important role it could play in development, as demonstrated by the volume and scope of its operational activities. Efforts had been made to make good the shortfall in resources by increasing the allocation from the regular budget. A discussion at the Conference would be useful to highlight the difficulties encountered and to examine current programmes so as to draw conclusions to guide future activities. Working conditions in hotels, restaurants and similar establishments was a subject that seemed to have been overlooked by standard-setting activities. Although of sectoral interest, the problem was sizeable and concerned both developing and developed countries. Such establishments offered great potential for employment and were of importance for national income. Preparatory work seemed well advanced, and it should be borne in mind that the Tripartite Technical Meeting in 1983 had unanimously adopted a recommendation that international labour standards should be adopted on the subject. Finally, it was necessary to update standards on safety and health in construction. This had been clearly stated by the recent Meeting of Experts.

Mr. Gallegos López (Government, Mexico) considered that priority should be given to the subject of technical co-operation in view of the continuing reduction in resources. Second priority should be given to working conditions in hotels, restaurants and similar establishments, which were a key area for job creation and an important source of revenue. Third priority should be given to the working and employment conditions of part-time workers.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) stated that the Conference had not yet discussed in depth or at all seriously such important questions as unemployment and the right to work, the social and economic aspects of disarmament, the negative effects on workers and on their trade unions of the activities of transnational corporations, or the protection of workers' income against inflation. His Government had constantly drawn the attention of the Governing Body and the Director-General to the need to consider such topics, but the present paper did not take this proposal into account. The section of the Office paper dealing with safety and health in construction included an incorrect reference to his country: such documents should be objective and impartial and should reflect the situation in member States, based on national sources of information. As regards the section concerning part-time employment, the paper attempted to hide the real reasons why so many workers were employed on this basis in developed capitalist countries. It referred to policies to increase the number of part-time workers as playing an important role in overcoming unemployment, particularly among young people, whereas such policies could only have a short-term effect that would not last and would in no way resolve the basic problem. Furthermore, in paragraph 40 the paper seemed to predetermine the type of instrument to be adopted on the subject, and this was highly inappropriate, for it was neither for the Office nor the Governing Body to decide on the nature of any instrument adopted. As regards the choice of three items from the list presented, preference should be given, in order of priority to: social security and employment; protection of workers in the event of the insolvency of their employer; and working and employment conditions of part-time workers.

Mr. Fotheringham (Government, Australia) stated that priority should be given to the subject of technical co-operation. Second choice should fall to safety and health in construction, and the third item selected should cover the working and employment conditions of part-time workers, in which greater regulation was necessary.
Mr. Martinek (Government, Austria) thought that there seemed to be a broad consensus in favour of technical co-operation as the first priority. He, too, was in favour of this item, for it was necessary to define the ILO's specific mandate. The tripartite nature of the Organisation had to be borne in mind in both the promotion and implementation of technical co-operation. Second priority should go to social security and employment. Restructuring was necessary both in employment systems and social security schemes so as to promote employment. The third item should cover safety and health in construction, although he also attached importance to the working and employment conditions of part-time workers and to the protection of workers in the event of the insolvency of their employer.

Mr. Riikonen (Government, Finland) was in favour of selecting three technical items for the Conference agenda. In line with the other Nordic countries, he felt that first priority should be given to a discussion of technical co-operation. While it would not result in an instrument, an in-depth review of the ILO's technical co-operation programme could be of great interest and value. Second priority should go to safety and health in construction. The hazards facing construction workers were greater than those occurring in any other industry or occupation, and existing standards were no longer relevant to modern techniques, a fact acknowledged by the recent Meeting of Experts. The third choice should be the working and employment conditions of part-time workers. Although it had been included in proposals for the Conference agenda since 1976, it had not yet gained sufficient support. The three reasons given in support of its selection in the Office paper were extremely valid: part-time employment had increased all over the world, both in the industrialised and the developing countries, and there was every sign that this growth would continue. Part-time workers often suffered discrimination on account of inadequate legislation, and it should not be forgotten that the majority of workers in this category were women. They faced considerable problems regarding their working hours and social security arrangements, although part-time work offered for some a more flexible and convenient form of employment. As regards the agenda of future Conference sessions, serious consideration should be given to chemical safety, and this had been emphasised in the resolution concerning the promotion of measures against risks and accidents arising out of the use of dangerous substances and processes in industry, adopted by the Conference in 1985.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) considered that the Office paper had been well prepared. Two of the proposals - technical co-operation, and social security and employment - seemed to be meeting with almost unanimous support, and he too was pleased to speak in their favour. A discussion of technical co-operation activities was necessary in order to clarify general policy and establish guidelines and specific criteria. As regards social security and employment, it was time to seek new instruments to replace the outdated standards. For the third choice, however, two subjects merited attention: safety and health in construction, for which the existing standards were out of date, and the working and employment conditions of part-time workers, which perhaps deserved even greater attention, as this subject was hardly touched upon by ILO standards.

Mr. Lipatov (Government, Ukrainian SSR) attached great importance to the selection of items for the Conference agenda. This task should not be approached as a mechanical choice of a certain number of subjects, but rather as a well-considered definition of priorities in the light of the most serious social problems faced by workers in all countries. Once again, however, the Office proposals did not attack the key problems affecting millions of people in the modern world, despite the fact that over the past few years a number of
governments, including his own, had made proposals to the Conference and to
the Governing Body concerning items for inclusion on the Conference agenda
that were clearly within the ILO's competence, such as the relation between
disarmament and labour policy, the employment effects of disarmament and the
reallocation of the resources liberated by disarmament to peaceful
activities. Nor had the agenda included items on unemployment, unemployment
insurance, the right to work, the protection of workers employed by
multinational enterprises or the responsibility of governments to resolve
these problems. In view of the numbers of unemployed people in the
capitalist countries, a Convention on the right to work or promoting measures
in this field should be at the heart of the ILO's main concerns. The Office
paper did not mention the issue. This was obviously because the Governing
Body, which was responsible for selecting the items for the Conference agenda,
often acted without taking due account of the views expressed by member States
at the Conference. The time had come to change the procedure for the
selection of items for the agenda, so as to ensure the broad participation of
all member States. As regards the proposals in the Office paper, however,
priority should be given to social security and employment; although the
approach outlined in the Office paper did not address the main problem, which
was to eliminate unemployment and ensure the right to work, an instrument
along the lines set out in the Office paper could do something to alleviate
the plight of the millions of unemployed. The other two items should deal
with the protection of workers in the event of the insolvency of their
employer, and the working and employment conditions of part-time workers.

Mr. Wang (Government, China) considered that priority should be given to
technical co-operation as the basis for a general discussion at the 1987
Conference. Technical co-operation was coming to occupy an increasingly
important position in the work of the Organisation. The ILO's operational
activities helped generate income, paved the way for technological
improvements and helped in the implementation of international labour
standards. They were therefore of strategic significance. The ILO had now
accumulated considerable experience of such work, and the time had come to
take stock of what it had learnt in order to develop a general strategy for
the future, and in particular to prepare medium- and long-term programmes that
would be appropriate and effective in view of the conditions in developing
countries. The technical co-operation programme was faced with
difficulties: the continuing shortage of resources, coupled with a growing
demand for technical co-operation, made it essential to determine what was the
most effective means of using resources, both human and material. It was
also necessary to determine the priority areas for technical co-operation,
such as employment promotion, training or relief operations. Second priority
should go to the item concerning safety and health in construction:
technology and working conditions in construction had changed considerably
over the past few decades, and existing standards on the subject were no
longer adequate, requiring extensive revision, particularly in view of the
high accident rate. The third priority should be social security and
employment.

Mrs. Holmboe Ruge (Government, Norway) stated that the main arguments in
favour of her Government's choice of subjects had already been set out by
Mr. Riiikonen. First priority should go to technical co-operation, for in
1987 it would be ten years since the Conference had last discussed the
issue. Second choice should fall to the working and employment conditions of
part-time workers, who comprised a rapidly growing category of workers in the
industrialised countries. For the third item, a choice could be made among
the proposed items on social security and employment, the regulation of
temporary work agencies, and safety and health in construction.
Mr. Dorais (Government, Canada) found the Office proposals to be of a very high quality. While he would have preferred to choose only two technical items, he was prepared to accept the consensus view that there should be three. As regards the choice, a consensus seemed to have emerged in favour of technical co-operation, and he was pleased to support this. Second choice should go to the working and employment conditions of part-time workers, for this was a rapidly growing sector in most countries, and very few instruments actually applied to it. The third priority would then be the night work of women, because it concerned a large number of workers and also because Convention No. 59 required revision in the light of more recent attitudes and practice. It would be sensible to review an existing instrument each year.

Mr. Crespo Rodas (Government, Bolivia) was in favour of selecting three technical items. The reasons in favour of technical co-operation had already been amply set out by previous speakers and he joined them in supporting it as a priority. Second choice should fall on working conditions in hotels, restaurants and similar establishments, as this sector employed a large number of workers and was likely to be an area of growth in view of the expansion of tourism, thereby constituting an important source of national income. The third priority should be the item concerning the regulation of temporary work agencies. However, in this connection it should be borne in mind that there was a considerable difference between agencies of this type operating in industrialised countries and those in developing countries, particularly in terms of the forms of employment they covered. The lack of regulation was the cause of some degree of exploitation.

Mr. Kazmi (Government, Pakistan) stated that in order to ensure that the work of the Conference was effective it was necessary to restrict the number of technical items on its agenda to a minimum. However, in the present case he was prepared to accept the consensus that seemed to have emerged in favour of three technical items. The first priority was technical co-operation: the last comprehensive discussion of technical co-operation had taken place in 1977, and since then the entire pattern and concept of technical co-operation had undergone radical changes. The downward trend in resources had prompted greater consideration for the cost effectiveness of technical co-operation, and donors were also seeking to influence the use of resources. At the same time the needs of developing countries were becoming increasingly complex, and greater selectivity was therefore needed in the choice of technical co-operation inputs and the approaches adopted. Sources of funding had diversified, and the different priorities advocated by the different funding agencies made the ILO's task more difficult. For all these reasons an in-depth examination of the entire technical co-operation programme would prove extremely useful.

Second priority should go to safety and health in construction, for existing standards were no longer appropriate to the technology used. Hazards in the industry had increased enormously, and a new instrument on occupational safety and health issues would be extremely valuable. The third item selected should be the working and employment conditions of part-time workers. The large number of workers in this category, their working and employment conditions and the problems surrounding their legal status made it necessary to lend consideration to this subject. The reasons set out in the Office paper more than adequately demonstrated this. The ILO should produce an instrument to provide part-time workers with some guarantees regarding their working hours, rest periods, conditions of remuneration, protection against unjustifiable dismissal, access to welfare services and participation in trade union activities.
Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) attached chief priority to the item concerning technical co-operation, which seemed to have met with almost universal support. The other two items selected should concern the regulation of temporary work agencies and the protection of workers in the event of the insolvency of their employer.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) noted the agreement that seemed to have emerged in favour of technical co-operation, which he supported as the first priority. The second proposal in the Office paper, social security and employment, did not unfortunately seem to have met with much support, but it was unjustifiable to think of eliminating this proposal forever from the list of possibilities, as suggested by the Employers' spokesman. The working and employment conditions of part-time workers seemed to have received some measure of support, and the Office paper had adequately dealt with the complexity of the issues involved. However, paragraph 24 seemed inaccurate in its reference to his own country, and he would be happy to rectify this error with the author. That subject merited consideration as the third item.

Mr. Marton (Government, Hungary) attached great importance to the selection of items for the Conference agenda. One aspect of the Conference which deserved attention was its duration: although the shorter 1985 session had not been satisfactory, this should not deter the Governing Body from reducing the duration of the Conference at a later date. With better preparation and organisation the Conference could be made shorter without any adverse effects on its results. There were also obvious financial advantages to be gained from reducing the duration of the Conference.

In recent years, the pace of standard setting seemed to have lost its momentum, and he therefore felt that in 1987 the Conference agenda should include three items that would lead to a double discussion and the adoption of standards. However, this seemed unlikely. The first priority should be given to social security and employment. The substantial structural changes made in a number of national economies had brought considerable difficulties for the workers they affected, bringing unemployment and serious needs for training and retraining. Governments and employers had an obligation to ensure that such changes imposed only a minimum of inconvenience to workers, and such obligations were best set out in international labour standards. Structural changes and increased competition in the labour market also made it necessary to protect workers in the event of the insolvency of their employer, and this item also merited selection. Placing the protection of workers in case of employers' insolvency in the second place, he considered that the third priority should go to the item concerning the working and employment conditions of part-time workers. The numbers of these workers were growing, and that form of work was particularly favoured by women with small children. An exchange of views and a new instrument would be useful.

Mr. Siktanc (Government, Czechoslovakia) considered that the most pressing labour problem of the modern world was the need to ensure adequate means of subsistence for all workers. This meant stable employment, adequately remunerated, or in the absence of the former, the satisfaction of their needs through social security benefits. These two fields should be studied together. Three of the proposals in the Office paper addressed this requirement. These were, in his own order of priority: social security and employment; the working and employment conditions of part-time workers; and the protection of workers in the event of the insolvency of their employer. The first two items reflected present-day concern at the persistently high levels of unemployment suffered in most countries. This did not mean that
the other proposals were less important, for they all merited extensive examination, but the essential need was to protect workers' standards of living. He recalled that his own Government had on a number of occasions stressed that the ILO should primarily focus on helping to ensure workers' well-being in a life of dignity, security and social justice, and in freedom and peace. Unfortunately, this concern had not been reflected in the Office paper.

Mrs. Hernandez Oliva (Government, Cuba) expressed a preference for a reduction in the number of technical items considered by the Conference, considering that priority should be attached to the revision of existing standards. However, as in 1987 there would no item left over from the previous year for a second discussion, two technical items would be acceptable. These should be, first, social security and employment, viewed not only in terms of cash benefits, but also in terms of effective employment policies aimed at reducing unemployment, which affected millions of workers, most of them in market economy countries and developing countries. The second item should be technical co-operation, in favour of which adequate arguments had already been put forward by previous speakers. Should a third item be selected, this should be the item concerning the protection of workers in the event of the insolvency of their employer.

Mr. Yumjav (Government, Mongolia) was in favour of selecting three technical items. First priority should be given to technical co-operation. The second item should concern social security and employment, while the third choice fall on the protection of workers in the event of the insolventy of their employer. He fully supported and shared the view expressed by the Government representatives of a number of socialist countries, including the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR, that the Conference agenda should cover such important issues for workers as the relationship between disarmament and social security and the protection of workers employed by multinational enterprises, as well as the struggle against unemployment and promotion of the right to work. He trusted that full account would be taken of this view in future.

Mr. Crespo Valera (Government, Spain) considered that all the proposals in the Office paper merited consideration, but first priority should be given to technical co-operation. This had been adequately supported by previous speakers. The second priority was safety and health in construction, a sector where the number of accidents was increasing constantly. Thirdly, the item concerning social security and employment should be included in view of the need to include the protection of workers in active employment policies. However, the Office paper had failed to mention an issue that was of some importance regarding unemployment benefits, particularly in his own country. This was the payment of a lump-sum benefit to workers who on losing their employment wished to become self-employed. This was one measure that would be a useful element, bringing positive results, in any active employment promotion policy.

The sitting closed at 6.15 p.m.
SECOND SITTING
(Tuesday, 12 November 1985, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.35 a.m., with Mr. Oechslin in the Chair.

SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Date, place and agenda of the 73rd (1987) Session
of the Conference (cont.)

Mr. Tos (Government, Yugoslavia) pointed out that as a developing country Yugoslavia fully supported the inclusion of the item on technical co-operation. On the question of night work of women, the present Convention was no longer consistent with the experience acquired as a result of scientific and social developments in the world. Working women should be protected against occupational risks on equal terms with men, and enjoy additional protection only to take account of their role in respect of maternity. The opinion was widely held that some special protective provisions might even lead to discrimination, and run counter to the demand for equal opportunities for men and women. The main principle to be followed when revising existing instruments as well as adopting new ones should be to make them as flexible as possible so that they could be implemented gradually. His Government therefore supported the proposal for the inclusion of night work of women in the agenda.

Mr. Bhatnagar (Government, India) recalled that on a number of occasions his Government had suggested that the subject of workers' participation in management should be given priority as an agenda item. Despite an assurance that it would be kept in view for future consideration, there was no mention of it among the proposals for the 1987 agenda. Yet the Director-General's Report to the 71st Session of the Conference had referred in some detail to the role played by workers' participation in many countries. In India there had been a very encouraging response in the way of higher productivity and output wherever workers' participation schemes had been properly implemented, and it was time to consider their extension to all enterprises employing workers above a specified number. A discussion of this topic and a sharing of experience amongst member countries would be a significant step towards the promotion of harmonious industrial relations and would be of benefit to all social partners. He therefore hoped that the Office would not lose sight of this item when considering agenda items for future sessions of the Conference.

As concerns the priority to be attached to the topics proposed in the Office paper, his Government could subscribe fully to the consensus reached between the Workers and Employers and many Government speakers in favour of technical co-operation and safety and health in construction, with higher priority being given to the former. However, it would give even greater priority to the item on working conditions in hotels, restaurants and similar establishments, in view of the vulnerability of many of the workers employed in these establishments as regards their conditions of work and wages.

---

1 See also first and fourth sittings.
Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom) said that his Government favoured limiting the agenda to two technical items, and could join the consensus as to which two items deserved priority. Like Mr. Muhr, he hoped that the focus of the item on technical co-operation would be concentrated on the ILO's particular area of competence, and that emphasis would be laid on tripartite participation. On this item there should be only a general discussion.

Mr. Sarmadi (Government, Islamic Republic of Iran) said that in his Government's view the Conference should be discussing more important topics such as the arms race and destructive policies aimed at squandering national resources and waging wars which were killing hundreds of thousands of people and forcing millions of others to become refugees, and the consequences of such policies for employment and the social and economic situation of the working people of the oppressed countries. Unfortunately, most of the topics proposed were of limited scope and of little concern to developing countries.

As regards night work of women, it appeared that under the pretext of equality between men and women efforts were being made to increase the number of women working at night. Instead of making efforts to limit night work for both men and women, the world was concerned only with material wealth, regardless of human suffering. It was to be hoped that the encouragement of night work for women would not lead to the establishment of night child-care centres, after which the ILO or some other organisation would be required to set minimum standards for such centres.

His delegation attached the highest priority to the following items: technical co-operation, on which there had not been a comprehensive discussion since 1977; safety and health in construction, a sector which was growing rapidly in many developing countries, and where safety and health were very important in view of the high accident rate; social security and employment, as it was important to provide more protection for the workers.

Mr. Schrader (Government, United States) stressed the importance attached by his Government to the choice of the items to be discussed at the 1987 Conference. The main consideration was that the ILO should concentrate on those issues which were appropriate to its mandate and on which it could make the most responsible and useful contribution for the benefit of governments, employers and workers. The United States Government was prepared to go along with the proposition that there should be three technical items on the agenda.

Like many others, he found it appropriate to give first priority to technical co-operation. Important developments had occurred since the last review in 1977, not the least of which was the fact that technical co-operation now accounted for slightly less than half the total amount allocated to all other ILO activities in the regular budget. The Office paper had suggested that emphasis might be laid on enhancing cost-effectiveness and improving efficiency, as well as on the inter-relationship between technical co-operation and ILO standard setting. The preliminary studies already undertaken by the Office in this connection would be a most appropriate input into a timely discussion of the whole range of technical co-operation.

He again echoed other speakers in expressing support for giving second priority to the subject of safety and health in construction. This item was of particular importance to the least developed countries, and it was quite apparent that the 1937 Convention and Recommendation were no longer adequate. A new standard could take into account the views expressed at the recent Meeting of Experts on the subject, and deal with hazards that the old
standards did not address. Bearing in mind the fact that in some countries more people were killed in the construction industry than in any other sector, this would be a most appropriate topic for consideration at the 1987 Conference.

Third priority might be given to working conditions in hotels, restaurants and similar establishments. This was a growing sector in developing countries, and being labour intensive it had considerable potential for the creation of jobs, particularly for women. It was also a substantial source of foreign exchange and many other benefits for developing countries. As stressed in the Office paper, working conditions compared unfavourably with those in other sectors, and there was no effective regulation of wages. There was also a need for guidance on problems relating to vocational and managerial training, and it was here that the ILO's training department and the Turin Centre could make a valuable contribution towards improving training facilities which would be complementary to the laying down of a new standard.

Mr. Ducray (Government, France) mentioned two subjects which his Government would have been glad to see on the agenda for the 1987 Conference. One was social security and employment, in view of the harmful effects of unemployment on social security schemes, particularly those financed on a pay-as-you-go basis. But his Government considered it preferable to concentrate on the problems of employment for the time being, particularly since it was probably the most highly advanced social protection schemes in the wealthiest countries which were under the greatest threat from unemployment. The other item in which his Government was interested was night work of women. But like Mr. Muhr, it considered that the time was not yet quite ripe for action which could lead to positive solutions.

Accordingly, mindful of the criteria which had always guided its choices hitherto - namely the universality, topicality and usefulness of the items envisaged - his Government would give its preference instead to the following items: technical co-operation, on which there was a consensus; safety and health in construction, since this was unquestionably one of the sectors in which the greatest changes had taken place in recent years, and it appeared essential to bring up to date the pre-war instruments dealing with an industry that was expanding throughout the world; and as a third item, working and employment conditions of part-time workers, since part-time work was one of the features of the change in forms of work to which the Organisation should devote attention. Although part-time work was making its appearance in industrialised countries under conditions which needed to be studied further, this type of activity had long been a tradition in the economies of other countries. This item was therefore also of universal interest.

Mr. Tikriti (Government, Iraq) agreed with all those who had spoken in favour of limiting the agenda to a maximum of three technical items so as to give everyone concerned the opportunity to discuss them seriously and in sufficient depth. His Government joined with the majority that had emerged in favour of giving technical co-operation first priority and safety and health in construction second priority, for the reasons which it had already indicated on other occasions.

The third item his Government supported was night work for women, which had been a source of preoccupation even before the ILO came into being. The matter had been discussed at the first ILO Conference in 1919, and a Convention had been adopted prohibiting the employment of women at night in industry. This Convention had since been revised twice, but all three instruments applied only to industry, and there were no Conventions dealing with night work of women in non-industrial sectors. This shortcoming had
been a spur to further discussion in developing and advanced countries on night work in general, and particularly for women. There was a lack of agreement among countries as to how far the restriction of night work for women was compatible with equal treatment between men and women. Night work should be abolished or restricted because of the nature of the work and not on the ground of sex. But the existing provisions lacked clarity, and his Government accordingly considered that it was time to adopt a new Convention which would amend and replace Convention No. 89 and should be based on an entirely different approach. The new instrument should apply to men and women alike, cover other sectors as well as industry and take into consideration working conditions in general. Rather than forbidding or restricting night work for a particular group, it should state that night work was to be regulated through consultation and negotiation, with due regard for national circumstances.

Finally, some speakers had tried to divert the Governing Body's attention to political issues totally unrelated to the matters under discussion, but their remarks were quite mistaken and based either on ulterior motives or ignorance of the facts.

Mr. Joedonagoro (Government, Indonesia) considered that, in choosing the agenda items for the 73rd Session of the Conference, the following criteria should be applied: firstly, urgency of the need; secondly, the nature of the problem; thirdly, the probable impact of the item; and fourthly, the likely changes in the situation from now to 1987 and thereafter.

It was appropriate to refer to technical co-operation rather than technical assistance as the receiving countries should participate fully and actively in this process. Even greater importance was being attached to TCDC. As regards funding, the North-South dialogue had shown clearly that the countries of the South wished greater amounts to be made available in order to narrow the gap between the developing and the developed countries. The Governing Body was not faced with an easy decision, but keeping the criteria he had mentioned in mind, he suggested that the items to be chosen for the 1987 agenda should be, first, technical co-operation and, second, social security and employment.

He wondered whether the question of protection of workers in the event of the insolvency of their employer could not be incorporated in the item on social security, since the main principles involved were severance pay, unemployment benefit funds, retraining or conversion training, placement services and other government measures.

The third item should be working and employment conditions of part-time workers, as part-time work could be an important method of dealing with the unemployment problem. The other items proposed also deserved to be discussed at the Conference, but if this were not possible they should be dealt with in other ways, such as through seminars or research projects, which could be reported back to the Governing Body.

Mr. Russomano (Government, Brazil) recalled that on the previous day a majority view had gradually emerged in favour of giving first priority to technical co-operation, in view of its great importance in the world of today, and second priority to safety and health in construction. The debates at the current sitting had confirmed these preferences. The Government of Brazil agreed with these priorities, especially the second, since public works projects were a useful means of combating unemployment while at the same time stimulating various sectors of a country's economic production; for this reason much stress had been laid on this type of construction recently in the developing countries.
(As for the third item, his Government felt a choice could be made between the item on temporary work and that on part-time work, because both constituted legal processes that had arisen from what might be termed the right to work in a time of crisis, and no international standards as yet regulated either of them. However, it would give its preference to the topic which seemed to have received most support in the Governing Body, namely part-time work.

The Chairman noted that the continuation of the discussion had confirmed that, with a few exceptions, there was consensus in favour of three technical items rather than two. There was general agreement that one of these items should be technical co-operation, so worded as to make it clear that the discussion would be concerned solely with ILO programmes. There was also a consensus in favour of safety and health in construction as the second technical item. Opinions were, however, divided as to what the third item might be. There was considerable support for the items on part-time workers, social security and employment and night work of women. It would be preferable to settle this question by consensus rather than by a vote.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the Employers' group, said that his group had reconsidered the matter in the light of the debate that had taken place. Although the Employers would have preferred night work as the third item, with part-time work as a possible alternative, they had noted that there appeared to be much wider support for the item on social security and employment. In order to avoid having to vote on this issue, and being aware of the priority attached to employment, the Employers wished to make a proposal that might solve the problem. They would be prepared to accept the item on social security and employment if it were reworded to read "Employment promotion and social security", so as to ensure that the gist of the discussion was centred upon employment growth rather than unemployment insurance. The Office paper mentioned some of the difficulties encountered in developing countries in connection with unemployment insurance, and this had been a major consideration in the discussions in the Employers' group. While hoping that care would be taken to avoid politicising the debate on this item in the Conference Committee, the Employers were prepared to agree to an item couched in the terms they had suggested, in the hope and expectation that, in return for this compromise, the item on night work of women would be selected for the agenda of the 1988 Conference.

As a result, the Employers now proposed that the three items should be technical co-operation (for general discussion), safety and health in construction, and employment promotion and social security.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) welcomed the Employers' decision. For many years the Workers had repeatedly drawn attention to the importance of the question of employment, and had stressed that the emphasis should be laid on employment promotion through appropriate employment policies. They would therefore find no difficulty in agreeing to the wording the Employers proposed. This would presumably imply the revision of Convention No. 44; the Workers had already expressed their readiness to rephrase earlier standards rather than creating new ones. In this connection, it was necessary to go beyond ensuring financial compensation for the unemployed and to seek to promote employment. This was a good illustration of the co-operative spirit in the Governing Body and the weight which the opinions of the two non-governmental groups exercised in the tripartite structure. The Workers would always continue to seek consensus of this kind through compromise rather than voting, taking into account also the views of Government representatives.
The Employers had expressed the hope that night work of women would be taken into account for the 1988 agenda. The Workers were also concerned about the growing number of denunciations of Convention No. 89 by countries which had ratified it. If the present trend were to persist the Convention would lose its purpose and value as an instrument of protection. The Workers would be prepared in due course to take part in a discussion concerning the applicability of this Convention in practice. But the sharp differences in the views expressed during the present debate had shown that it would have been premature to place this item on the agenda of the Conference until a clearer idea could be formed of what was entailed. Perhaps this would be possible by the time the 1988 agenda came up for discussion. In the meantime, the compromise reached might enable a long-standing issue to be settled, and this should be a cause for general satisfaction.

The Chairman put it to the Governing Body that the second item proposed in the Office paper should be reworded "Employment promotion and social security".

Mr. Gebre Medhin (Government, Ethiopia) recalled that his Government had previously stated the position of the African Government members, who accorded first priority to technical co-operation, second priority to safety and health in construction, and third priority to night work of women. There was a consensus in the Governing Body in favour of the first two of these items but not the third. On behalf of the African Government members, he requested that the decision be deferred until the afternoon so that the group could meet to decide whether to support the consensus that was now emerging in favour of an item on employment promotion and social security.

The Chairman noted that the Governing Body appeared to be very close to reaching unanimous agreement and it would be preferable for the decision to be truly unanimous. Consequently he was prepared to delay the final decision until the afternoon, on the understanding that the discussion was closed. He appealed to all those who had not included the item on social security and employment in their original selection to take into account the situation that had developed in the course of the discussion so that unanimous agreement could be reached on the three items, all of which were of very great importance.

In the meantime, certain decisions could already be taken. The first was that three technical items should be placed on the agenda, to which there seemed to be no opposition. Secondly, one of these items should be technical co-operation. The Director-General might wish to indicate whether it would be preferable to refer to "ILO technical co-operation", so as to take into account certain comments that had been made, as well as to reflect the contents of the Office paper.

The Director-General pointed out that the report he would be submitting to the Conference on this subject would be focused on the role and activities of the Organisation in the field of technical co-operation. He hoped that this reply would reassure those who had expressed anxiety lest the debate should cover too wide a range. The discussion would thus be centred upon the ILO's technical co-operation activities and the role the Organisation could usefully play through technical co-operation. The change in wording just proposed by the Chairman corresponded exactly to what was going to be discussed. However, in view of the explanation he had just given, the title could equally be left as it stood.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) recalled that the Workers had already expressed the view that the title should
not be too restrictive. The discussion should not be confined to the ILO's own tasks, but should also deal with co-operation with other technical co-operation agencies and donors, as well as the question of how to instil the concept of tripartism in other organisations. The Conference's hands should not be tied by the title. In his opinion, it would be preferable to keep the present wording, provided that the Director-General specified in his report exactly what the discussion should cover.

The Chairman pointed out that the term "technical co-operation" had been used in the past when this item was on the agenda. In his opinion, it was not worthwhile having a lengthy discussion about wording since the Director-General would certainly take into account in his report all the concurring views expressed to the effect that the ILO must deal with its own problems, but these problems might well be also of concern to other organisations.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) felt that in the eyes of other organisations, or other ministries in the case of his own country, the title was the decisive factor, since the report only came later. He would therefore prefer the title to read "Technical co-operation in the ILO". The discussion would naturally cover technical co-operation in general, but too broad a title could give rise to problems.

The Director-General considered that once a decision had been taken to place technical co-operation as an item on the agenda, it was clear what was meant. Of course the Office would take into account all the remarks that had been made. Thirty years ago it would have been possible to talk about ILO technical co-operation in the narrow sense of the term because at that time it was very modest and financed almost entirely out of the Organisation's own resources. Today, technical co-operation had become something much more sophisticated, and all its forms and methods had to be taken into consideration. To take just one example, his report would probably have much to say about technical co-operation between developing countries (TCDC) - something unheard of 20 years ago which was undoubtedly going to become an important feature of technical co-operation. Matters like this should be dealt with in the report. But he could assure the Governing Body that he had no intention of bringing in matters extraneous to the concerns of the Governing Body or engaging in philosophical dissertation on technical co-operation in general. It was evident from the debate that the Governing Body wanted a clear, factual and straightforward report, and that was what the Office would endeavour to produce.

The Chairman drew attention to paragraph 186 of the paper before the Governing Body, which listed the broad topics that would be covered in the report and hence in the Conference discussion. These appeared to include all the subjects raised during the present debate: financing, quality and efficiency of programmes, relationship between co-operation and standard setting, tripartite participation, etc. There really seemed to be little point in engaging in a lengthy discussion on the title of the item.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) suggested that the title might be "The role of the ILO in technical co-operation", which would meet the concern expressed by Mr. Haase and avoid objections from other bodies that the ILO was encroaching on their field of activity.

Mr. Kabore (Government, Burkina Faso) was of the opinion that the term "technical co-operation" could be construed as covering a number of topics that were of the utmost importance to developing countries, such as employment
promotion, or the regulation of working conditions. It was the subject matter that counted, not the wording of the title.

The Chairman suggested that the Governing Body might agree to Mr. Muhr's proposal that the item be worded "The role of the ILO in technical co-operation", since the topics listed in paragraph 186 of the Office paper and the present discussion provided clear guidance for the preparation of the Director-General's Report. He further proposed that the Governing Body agree that the second technical item to be placed on the agenda should be "Safety and health in construction". This item was clearly defined, and the Governing Body would shortly be examining the report of a meeting of experts on the subject. The decision on the third item, for which the Employers and Workers had agreed on a compromise formula - "Employment promotion and social security" - would be taken that afternoon without reopening the discussion.

It was so decided.

THIRD ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Action on the resolutions adopted by the Conference at its 71st (1985) Session

The Chairman recalled that, as indicated in paragraph 2 of the Office paper, the Director-General would communicate these resolutions in the usual manner to the governments of member States and, through them, to the national employers' and workers' organisations, as well as to the intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations concerned. The Governing Body was not called upon to discuss the contents of the resolutions but to decide on the follow-up action to be taken on them, and he therefore requested the speakers to concentrate their remarks on the proposed points for decision.

Resolution concerning statistics of productivity

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) considered that it would be desirable for the Office to submit in 1986-87 an interim report on progress made in the formulation of recommendations with respect to concepts, definitions and methodologies.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Bolin, Deputy Director-General) indicated that the Office should be able to act on Mr. Koudriavtsev's suggestion as six work-months had already been allocated for preparatory work. But it was unlikely that a progress report could be presented before 1987.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the Office paper.

8378R/v.2
Resolution concerning the most urgent problems of Africa, and particularly food security

Mr. Kebede (Government, Ethiopia; Government Vice-Chairman) asked on behalf of the African Government members for the inclusion in the point for decision of an additional statement that the first progress report should be submitted to the pre-Conference sittings of the Governing Body in 1986. This had already been agreed by the Committee on Operational Programmes and he hoped that the Governing Body would agree to it in its turn. In concrete terms, his proposal was that the full stop at the end of subparagraph (b) of paragraph 13 be replaced by a semi-colon and the following words added: "the first such informative report should be submitted to the pre-Conference sittings of the Governing Body of the ILO in 1986".

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the Employers' gratitude to the Director-General for his prompt reaction to this resolution. He emphasised the importance of enabling employers' and workers' organisations to participate in its implementation, as provided for in paragraph 41 of the Programme of Action appended to it, since the support of these organisations was essential.

He also wished to draw attention to a point made by his African colleagues in the Employers' group to the effect that the food shortages affecting many African countries were not always attributable entirely to unfavourable natural conditions but sometimes resulted from a mistaken agrarian policy based on wrong incentives, as well as infrastructural shortcomings. In other words there were a whole series of questions that had to be taken into account when considering the Programme of Action for Africa.

The Employers' group also wished to stress that the section on education and training in the Programme of Action should be regarded as an essential element for furthering the economic objectives of the Programme, and steps must be taken to ensure that the necessary support was received from governments in order to overcome the administrative difficulties that often arose in this field.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) drew attention to the fact that this resolution was not addressed only to the ILO but also to member States. The Workers appealed to the governments of member States to pay due attention to this resolution and take the action required of them. They took it for granted that in addition to the reports to be put before the Governing Body the matter would continue to be followed in the normal way by the Committee on Operational Programmes, which could make the suggestions it considered appropriate to the Governing Body.

Mr. Kabore (Government, Burkina Faso) appreciated the speed with which the Office had reacted to this resolution calling for urgent action to help African countries, particularly those affected by drought. His Government strongly hoped that the missions sent to a number of countries in the Sahel would be followed up by concrete action on the part of the Organisation to help their population to become self-reliant for food.

Mr. Ducray (Government, France), in view of the importance attached to this resolution by his Government, wished to thank the ILO for having started so rapidly and painstakingly to set up the machinery for the implementation of this resolution. He drew attention to the implications for the 1986-87 budget of the financial measures proposed in paragraph 7 of the resolution, and accordingly supported the proposal made by Mr. Kebede that the first

Mr. Szikinger (Government, Hungary) urged the Office to place more stress than in the past on what co-operatives were doing in Africa so as to arouse greater interest in them in the countries concerned. The possibilities for action mentioned in paragraph 9 of the paper did not go far enough, and the Office needed to intensify its activities in this respect.

The Chairman noted that no objections had been raised to the amendment proposed by Mr. Kebede and accordingly presumed that the Governing Body agreed to it. He suggested that the words to be added at the end of paragraph 13(b) might be drafted more simply as follows: "the first such progress report to be submitted to the pre-Conference sittings of the Governing Body in May 1986".

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

Resolution concerning the promotion of measures against risks and accidents arising out of the use of dangerous substances and processes in industry

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) expressed satisfaction that an ad hoc expert meeting of the kind called for in the resolution had already taken place, and its report was before the Governing Body under item 9 on its agenda. This was evidence of an extremely rapid reaction to events which had focused attention with great acuity on the dangers to which thousands of people were exposed as a result of the transport and utilisation of substances of this kind. In paragraph 21(e) of the Office paper, reference was made to the need for the inclusion of an item on this subject in the agenda of an early session of the International Labour Conference, and the Workers hoped that it would be possible to place it on the agenda of the 1988 session of the Conference.

The resolution emphasised the basic responsibility of multinational enterprises' central management for the organisation and control of the management of their subsidiaries, but unfortunately this aspect, of such great importance to the Workers, was not specifically mentioned in paragraph 21. The Workers strongly felt that this was the only way of ensuring that all those in positions of responsibility in undertakings of this kind realised what was expected of them and acted in consequence.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the Employers' group, drew attention to the fact that the question of dangerous substances was also under consideration in the Working Party on Standards. The Employers wondered whether this should not be mentioned in the decision paragraph.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) likewise welcomed the fact that under the ninth item on its agenda the Governing Body would already be giving consideration to concrete developments arising out of this very important resolution. He stressed that problems of safety at the workplace should not be considered in isolation from the general problem of the environment as it affected the civilian population. As demonstrated by certain recent disasters, a distinction could not be made between hazards specific to an enterprise and general hazards for the environment in which the population lived. In paragraph 5(d) of the resolution, the Director-General was
requested to devote adequate attention and resources to the ILO's participation in the International Programme on Chemical Safety carried out jointly with the WHO and the UNEP. This request had considerable policy implications and in particular afforded an opportunity to join forces which might help to resolve the problem of workers' safety.

Paragraph 4(c) of the resolution called upon workers' organisations inter alia to initiate training courses for their safety and health representatives. The training required for the personnel responsible for protecting workers and the population against major hazards in industry, and particularly in the chemical industries, was so broad in scope that he wondered whether special courses should not be organised for such personnel, perhaps at the Turin Centre, which had the necessary time and expertise available.

Lastly, his Government warmly supported the idea that an item on this question of safety should be placed on the agenda of an early session of the Conference.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) agreed with Mr. Muhr that it would be advisable to refer more specifically to the question of the responsibility of transnational corporations in this subject area. When this question was discussed in the International Organisations Committee the Employer spokesman, Mr. Tata, had rightly recognised that transnational corporations had caused a great deal of harm to developing countries. For many years the USSR Government had called on the ILO to open its eyes to the harm the transnational corporations were doing to workers in both developed capitalist and developing countries. In their thirst for huge profits they failed to provide for adequate protection in their undertakings, particularly in developing countries. Accordingly, while not objecting to the measures the Office was proposing for the implementation of this resolution, he once again drew attention to the need to include in the agenda of an early session of the Conference an item on the protection of workers and their trade unions in the undertakings of transnational corporations, so that the problem could be discussed from every angle, taking into account inter alia the resolution now under discussion, with a view to enabling the ILO in due course to frame a Convention on the subject.

Mr. Tata (Employer, India) pointed out that the preceding speaker had misquoted certain remarks he had made in the International Organisations Committee. He had indeed stated that colonial systems had brought both benefits and disadvantages, but he had not applied this remark to multinationals in the terms suggested.

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom) commended the Office on the action it had taken to follow up this resolution, and stressed the importance his Government attached to practical measures to deal with the formidable problems posed by hazardous and volatile substances, problems which transcended national and ideological barriers. Hazard assessment and control involved complex interdisciplinary aspects. The Office proposals addressed these issues in practical terms, and he therefore supported the action proposed.

Mr. Szikinger (Government, Hungary) supported the Workers' proposal that the responsibilities of transnational corporations should be highlighted. The preamble to the Conference resolution stated that international labour standards on safety and health should be universally applied and strengthened, particularly with regard to the use of hazardous substances in industry. The ILO had an important role to play for the protection of employees of
transnational corporations which did not take the same safety measures in developing countries as they applied in their countries of origin. It should be stressed that it was the ILO's task to ensure respect for safety standards everywhere in the world.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) repeated that he had no objection to the measures proposed by the Office. He had earlier quoted a statement made by Mr. Tata in the International Organisations Committee as he had understood it when listening to it at the time. However, if Mr. Tata had not meant to say that transnational corporations caused great harm to developing countries through their activities, he himself was prepared to take responsibility for this opinion.

Mrs. Molkova (Government, Czechoslovakia) recalled that for a number of years her Government had expressed its reservations regarding the attitude of certain groups in the ILO which highlighted the economic contribution made by transnational corporations to the host countries without giving any serious consideration to the other side of the picture. The resolution was a stimulus to the operational and standard-setting activities of the ILO with a view to assisting developing countries in this respect. She supported Mr. Falchi in stressing the need for ILO assistance to train specialists in developing countries. Administrative and technical monitoring systems were not always adequate to cope with possible deliberate violations of basic safety standards in production. The Bhopal tragedy was just one of the many examples which could be cited in this connection.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 20 and 22 of the Office paper.

Resolution on equal opportunities and equal treatment for men and women in employment

Mrs. Caron (Government, Canada) supported the proposal for the effect to be given to this resolution. It seemed perfectly logical to refer the question of future standard setting in this area to the Governing Body Working Party on International Labour Standards. Her Government was also in favour of the proposals for research and the dissemination of information set out in paragraphs 34 and 35 of the Office paper. However, the paper was not explicit enough about the practical implementation of paragraph 18 of the resolution, and in particular subparagraphs (b) and (f). Subparagraph (b) called for the reinforcement of the capacity of the ILO to deal with technical co-operation programmes in favour of women and with the needs of working women in all aspects and all areas of work of the Office, while subparagraph (f) referred to strengthening the capacity of the ILO's organisational structures at headquarters and in the regions to deal with women workers' questions and to develop appropriate technical co-operation programmes. It would be most useful if in the near future the Office could submit a more detailed report to the Governing Body on the practical measures envisaged to implement these requests.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) pointed out that there still remained much to be done in the Office itself to achieve the aims of this resolution. While discussion on personnel policy in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee had been adjourned until February 1986, the Governing Body should bear in mind when considering this resolution that the ILO should set an example by putting its own house in order. This remark was addressed not only to the management of the Office,
but also to many governments which had expressed general concern on this subject without ever coming forward with concrete proposals for improving the position of women in the ILO.

The Workers had noted with some concern in the Committee on Operational Programmes that in 1984 only 5 per cent of the projects concerning women had been worked out in consultation with the trade unions, and hoped that there would be better collaboration in future.

Lastly, he drew attention to a discrepancy between the English and French versions of the Office paper as concerns the last sentence of paragraph 35. Whereas the English text referred to the development of guide-lines on trade union services available to women workers, the French text was somewhat more flexible, and might be thought more suitable. It would be acceptable for the Office to carry out a survey of trade union services being provided, but it would not be proper for it to lay down guide-lines in this respect.

Mr. Fotheringham (Government, Australia) agreed with Mrs. Caron's comments regarding the implementation of paragraphs 18(b) and (f) of the resolution. It might otherwise be assumed that, rather than being strengthened, the capacity of ILO structures at headquarters and at the regional level to deal with women's problems was in fact being weakened, and it would therefore be useful to receive a paper from the Office at the next session dealing specifically with these issues.

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom) supported the requests made by Mrs. Caron and Mr. Fotheringham for further information on the subject.

Mr. Schrader (Government, United States) said that the United States Government also agreed entirely with the comments made by Mrs. Caron.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) said that a number of considerations needed to be taken into account when preparing the programme of ILO activities in the field of equal opportunities for men and women. He agreed that the Declaration on Equality of Opportunity and Treatment for Women Workers adopted in 1975 was still as valid as ever, and considered it essential for the Office to develop a programme of activities based on the resolution adopted at the 71st Session of the International Labour Conference as well as the decisions taken at the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women, held in Nairobi, and in particular the strategies adopted there, which went as far as the year 2000. In his Government's opinion, such a programme should be designed in particular to assist and co-operate with ILO member States in defending the rights of women workers, as well as encouraging member States to co-operate more actively through an exchange of experience on the tackling of these problems. It would be advisable for the Governing Body to keep regularly under review the implementation of the resolution adopted at the 71st Session of the Conference.

As the USSR Government had already pointed out at that session of the Conference, as well as in the International Organisations Committee, the time was now ripe for the ILO to frame a new instrument on the subject of equal rights for men and women in employment; in this connection, the Conference resolution, in particular paragraph 15, referred to the possible need for such new standards. The Office should carefully analyse the recommendations of the Conference and make provision in the Programme and Budget for 1988-89 for convening a committee of experts to advise on the basic provisions to be embodied in such an instrument.
Mr. Heldal (Government, Norway) said that his Government had already made its views known during the discussion in the Committee on Operational Programmes on the assessment of ILO operational activities concerning women, and he therefore merely wished to add support to the remarks made by Mrs. Caron about the importance of the recommendations in paragraph 18 of the resolution, and particularly subparagraph 18(f). Special emphasis should also be placed on the recommendation in subparagraph 18(j) that the ILO should set an example in all its services and structures in the implementation of equality of opportunity and treatment between men and women.

Mr. Yumjav (Government, Mongolia) shared the opinion expressed by Mr. Koudriavtsev concerning the need for the ILO to develop a programme of action for the implementation of the resolution under discussion as well as decisions adopted at the Nairobi Conference. He also supported the proposal that detailed information be supplied concerning the implementation of the resolution and that the Governing Body keep the matter systematically under review. His Government was in favour of the adoption of new standards on the subject.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Bolin, Deputy Director-General) expressed gratitude for the appreciative remarks about the way the Office had reacted to this resolution. It was an important resolution, especially when viewed in conjunction with the strategies adopted by the Nairobi Conference. The Director-General intended to take the recommendations in both the ILO resolution and the Nairobi strategies fully into account.

However, the disappointment expressed by several members of the Governing Body at the lack of concrete proposals regarding two subparagraphs of paragraph 18 of the resolution dealing with structural action to be taken inside the ILO and its regional offices was understandable. The Office had thought it a little premature to report so soon to the Governing Body on such a very wide approach as that suggested in the resolution. That would require time, and perhaps new resources, but the Office would certainly endeavour to do whatever it could to strengthen its activities in various ways during the next biennium. This might entail the inclusion of further proposals in the 1988-89 programme and budget.

On the question of ILO technical co-operation projects in favour of women and the participation of women in such projects, there had already been a preliminary discussion in the Committee on Operational Programmes on the basis of an Office paper which contained a number of very concrete recommendations. This discussion would be continued in February 1986 and action would subsequently be taken on these recommendations.

He had taken note of Mr. Muhr's comments on the personnel aspects which would be discussed by the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee in February, and also agreed with Mr. Muhr that the reference to "guide-lines" in paragraph 35 of the Office paper should be changed to "survey", or a similar term.

As stated in paragraph 37 of the paper, reports on the implementation of the resolution and of the relevant parts of the Nairobi strategies would be submitted periodically to the Governing Body. In reply to Mrs. Caron, he indicated that the Office would do its best to report at the February-March 1986 session and should in any case be able to report during the coming year on the progress made in implementing some of the more concrete recommendations contained in the resolution.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 27, 31 and 38.

The sitting closed at 1 p.m.
THIRD SITTING
(Tuesday, 12 November 1985, afternoon)

At this sitting, which was held in private, the Governing Body considered the fourth item on its agenda (Report of the committee set up to examine the representation made by the Confederation of Costa Rican Workers (CTC), the Authentic Confederation of Democratic Workers (CATD), the United Confederation of Workers (CUT), the Costa Rican Confederation of Democratic Workers (CCTD) and the National Confederation of Workers (CNT), under article 24 of the Constitution alleging the failure by Costa Rica to implement international labour Conventions Nos. 81, 95, 102, 122, 127, 130, 131, 138 and 144).

In accordance with article 14, paragraph 4, of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the minutes of this sitting are published separately.
IV/1

FOURTH SITTING
(Tuesday, 12 November 1985, afternoon)

The sitting opened at 3.40 p.m. with Mr. Oechslin in the Chair.

FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee set up to examine the representation made by the Confederation of Costa Rican Workers (CTC), the Authentic Confederation of Democratic Workers (CATD), the United Confederation of Workers (CUT), the Costa Rican Confederation of Democratic Workers (CCTD) and the National Confederation of Workers (CNT), under article 24 of the Constitution alleging the failure by Costa Rica to implement international labour Conventions Nos. 81, 95, 102, 122, 127, 130, 131, 138 and 144

The Chairman publicly announced the decisions taken by the Governing Body at its third sitting, which was held in private:

The Governing Body approved the report and recommendations of the Committee and declared closed the procedure instituted against the Government of Costa Rica.

SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Date, place and agenda of the 73rd (1987) Session of the Conference (concl.)

Mr. Kebede (Government, Ethiopia; Government Vice-Chairman) speaking on behalf of the African Government members, noted that the Employers' and Workers' groups and some governments had reached consensus on giving high priority to the item dealing with social security and employment. The African Government members could join that consensus provided that, firstly, the item on night work of women, which they had favoured, was given priority for the agenda of the 1988 session of the Conference and, secondly, the wording of the item would place emphasis foremost on employment promotion; they held certain reservations about the social security aspect as its attainment would depend on the level of development in different member States.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the gratitude of the Employers' group to the African Government members for having agreed to accept this compromise and also for having brought the item on night work of women one step further towards selection for the 1988 session of the Conference.

1 See also first and second sittings.
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Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) likewise thanked the African Government members for having facilitated agreement on the Conference agenda. He could assure them that the Workers' group, in advocating the revision of the Unemployment Provision Convention, 1933 (No. 44), had always intended to place the employment promotion aspect in the forefront, while linking it to social security.

The Chairman welcomed the fact that unanimous agreement had been reached on the three technical items to be included in the agenda of the 73rd (1987) Session of the International Labour Conference.

The Governing Body decided that, in addition to the standing questions which the Conference would have before it, the following items should be placed on the agenda of the 73rd (1987) Session:

(a) employment promotion and social security;
(b) safety and health in construction;
(c) the role of the ILO in technical co-operation (general discussion).

FIFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Establishment, pursuant to the decision taken by the Governing Body under Article 10 of the Standing Orders concerning the procedure for the examination of representations under articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution, of a Commission of Inquiry under article 26, paragraph 4, of the Constitution to consider the observance of the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. III) by the Federal Republic of Germany

The Governing Body approved the proposals in paragraph 2 of the document.

Mr. Soubbotine (Worker, USSR) asked what provisions governed the functioning of commissions of inquiry. The establishment of such commissions always constituted an exceptional event in the life of the ILO, and their findings and recommendations had far-reaching consequences. While the members of the commission were required to make a solemn declaration like the judges of the International Court of Justice, the composition and functioning of the commission, unlike the International Court, did not appear to be subject to any rules of procedure. This gave rise to a number of questions, such as: how were the candidates for membership of the commission selected, and on the basis of what criteria; why was the Governing Body not entitled to choose from among a greater number of candidates; what text laid down the powers and rights of the commission and specified the periodicity of its meetings and the time-limit within which it had to complete its work? In his opinion, the commission should have formal rules of procedure.

The Chairman pointed out that the establishment of commissions of inquiry was based on articles 27 and following of the Constitution as well as on past practice followed by the Governing Body in this respect. Whether this practice should be embodied in formal rules remained an open question, but for the time being the Governing Body should proceed in the same manner as before.
The Director-General observed that the practice followed by the Governing Body had its roots in the Constitution and appeared to have functioned satisfactorily in all the cases in which commissions of inquiry had been instituted in the past. The Office had sought to abide strictly by the Constitution and existing practice in making its proposals. The selection of the members of a commission of inquiry, who had to meet extremely high standards of competence, experience and objectivity was no easy task, and he had personally given this matter a great deal of thought and engaged in extensive consultations before coming forward with the three names proposed in the Office paper. While the procedure was based essentially on practice, the latter was not in the least arbitrary and fully respected the letter and spirit of the Constitution. It was of course always possible to consider whether it was necessary to go beyond this, but he had the impression that the existing practice met the needs of the situation and had been found useful both by the Governing Body and by the countries to which the article 26 procedure had been applied.

The Chairman felt that the three persons designated for membership of the commission, all of whom were outstanding jurists with wide experience of international work, could be relied upon to work out their own rules of procedure.

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

SIXTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Meeting of Experts on Safety and Health in Construction

(Geneva, 9-18 September 1985)

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the Employers, felt that this meeting had produced a good report. In the light of the decision just taken by the Governing Body concerning the agenda of the 1987 session of the Conference, the meeting had been fully justified and had complied with the task assigned to it.

However, he wished to make some general remarks arising out of the four reports of meetings before the Governing Body at its present session. The meeting covered by the present item was called a "meeting of experts"; the other three meetings were designated as a "tripartite advisory meeting", a "tripartite symposium" and a "tripartite ad hoc meeting of consultants" respectively. The exact composition formula also varied from meeting to meeting. As this was somewhat confusing and since all were tripartite meetings, the Office should examine whether it was not possible to achieve greater uniformity in the description and composition of such meetings.

Mr. Koudriaevtsev (Government, USSR), referring to the proposals made by the Meeting of Experts in its conclusions with regard to the subjects to be included in new international instruments for the construction industry, felt that such provisions were already reflected in the Occupational Safety and Health Convention (No. 155) and Recommendation (No. 164) which were applicable to all branches of industry including construction. If a new Convention was required, it should deal mainly with the hazards arising solely in the construction industry and requiring practical recommendations that would help increase safety in this industry. Such problems included safety on building sites high above the ground, hydraulic and underground construction work and...
working conditions on sites far removed from residential areas. This would respond to present-day needs and would also be in line with the recommendations made in the report of the Tripartite Ad Hoc Meeting of Consultants on Methods of Prevention of Major Hazards in Industry held in October 1985.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) said that the Workers had already indicated the priority they attached to the subject of safety and health in construction when discussing the Conference agenda for 1987, and supported the point for decision in paragraph 7 of the Office paper. They felt that the general points raised by Mr. Lindner deserved consideration, but should be examined in the framework of the programme and budget rather than on a piecemeal basis. The exact number of participants at a particular meeting would depend on the importance and complexity of the subject matter discussed at the meeting. They also wondered whether it was desirable for Governing Body members to be appointed as participants in meetings which were set up to advise the Governing Body on particular subjects. If this tendency spread, such meetings would become de facto Governing Body committees. All these questions should be properly discussed before the adoption of the Programme and Budget for 1988-89.

The Chairman was certain that the Office would take due note of the wishes expressed concerning rationalisation of the terminology and procedures used.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 7 of the Office paper.

SEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Tripartite Advisory Meeting on the Integration of Youth into Working Life in Industrialised Countries
(Geneva, 30 September-4 October 1985)

Mr. Ducray (Government, France), who had chaired this meeting, introduced the report. The Tripartite Advisory Meeting had been fully aware that it was dealing with one of the most crucial issues facing the industrialised countries today, namely, the present level of youth unemployment and the prospects for young people in economic activity in the years to come. Demographic factors and economic contingencies had sometimes in the past been invoked as excuses for not tackling this problem in depth, but it was now clear that the success or failure of our societies would to a large extent be measured by their ability to find a solution thereto. In evaluating the results of the Meeting and the lessons which could be drawn for the discussion of youth problems that would take place at the 1986 Session of the Conference, he could point to a number of positive features as well as some less satisfactory aspects.

The first positive feature was the continuing concern of the ILO with the problem of youth unemployment, which had been repeatedly highlighted by the Director-General in his reports and had in particular been the subject of conclusions on young people and work adopted by consensus at the Third European Regional Conference in 1979. The second positive aspect was the excellent and very thorough working document prepared by the Office, which had enabled the Meeting to focus its discussions on a number of major issues,
which were the following: policy design and organisation, which had also led to a discussion of social guarantees for youth; education, training and vocational guidance, and anticipated developments in employment and problems of work. However, on the latter question, the Meeting had not advanced far and had soon become aware that it did not have sufficient information to be able to forecast accurately the main trends and features of employment in the years ahead. The third positive element was the high quality and degree of openness shown by the participants from all three groups, regardless of their national origin. In this connection, he wished to pay special tribute to the Employer Vice-Chairman, Mr. Magnusson from Norway and the Worker Vice-Chairman, Mr. Lloyd from Australia. The fourth positive feature was the high technical level of the debates, which had allowed the Meeting to bridge the traditional differences between employers and workers, as well as among governments.

A less satisfactory aspect was the shortage of time available to discuss such a vast and complex subject and to adopt a report and conclusions. This had also placed a severe strain on the secretariat of the Meeting, which had been somewhat understaffed but had nevertheless coped effectively. The Meeting had as a result not been able to give sufficient attention to the important changes that had taken place in policies and attitudes between 1975, when the first effects of the crisis on youth employment began to be felt, and the present time, when the problem of unemployment had become persistent and its structural and qualitative aspects had come to the foreground.

Perhaps the main lesson which could be drawn from the Meeting was that the problem of the integration of youth into working life in industrialised countries should be placed in the centre of the ILO's concerns and programmes.

As regards the conclusions adopted by the Meeting, the first point that had been stressed was that the problems of youth unemployment and the integration of young people into working life were closely tied to the overall economic situation, and had to be solved by dynamic economic policies, requiring imaginative measures designed to meet ever-changing needs. While the Meeting had not been pessimistic in this regard, it had been fully aware of the distance that still had to be covered before national economics achieved this goal. The next fundamental point was that the training of young people should be regarded as a basic productive investment for the future, which should be promoted by all three social partners. This aim should be achieved by means of global programmes and not by measures directed towards particular categories which would have the effect of discriminating against other categories of workers. Such global programmes should also ensure a better integration of short-, medium- and long-term objectives, as measures taken in favour of young people without being linked to more long-term prospects were not likely to be effective. It was also stressed that no real solution could be found in the absence of general agreement and this required tripartite concertation at the national level in laying down objectives as well as a high degree of decentralisation when it came to implementing the programmes in practical terms at the regional and local levels.

Another important finding reached by the Meeting was that educational systems were too often isolated from the world of work and that a solution to the problems that had resulted from this situation should be found through policies designed to link more closely education, training and employment. Governments, employers and workers had a joint responsibility for dealing with all three aspects. A further subject that had been extensively debated related to the right to work and the social guarantees that should be offered to young people. It was generally agreed that the right to work, in whatever manner it was formulated, called for the promotion of full, productive and
freely chosen employment. Everyone had also been agreed on the need for a social guarantee for young people consisting in open access to vocational training or work experience. Finally, the creation of stable and productive employment should be the aim of all economic policies and programmes of action. The Meeting also considered the question of part-time work and unanimously agreed that, although it could be appropriate in some cases and form the subject of agreements at the enterprise level, it should not be considered as a universal or desirable remedy for solving the youth unemployment problem.

The Meeting recognised the value of projects of public utility, community initiatives, co-operative activities and self-managed projects, in the design and implementation of which all concerned should be closely involved, on the understanding that all programmes of this kind should in the final resort aim at providing young people with stable employment.

Lastly, the conclusions of the Meeting stressed the importance of ensuring equality of opportunity for young men and women and referred to the Conclusions on Equality in Employment adopted at the last session of the Conference. In addition to the general policies which it had advocated, the Meeting also felt that programmes should be designed to meet the special needs of migrant workers' children, handicapped young people and the rising numbers of school drop-outs. The Meeting had undoubtedly provided a useful basis for preparing the discussion on youth problems that would take place at the next session of the Conference. It had highlighted the important role which the ILO could play in collecting and analysing information, evaluating policies and setting guide-lines in this field. The effect of national policies had to be evaluated permanently since the situation underwent continual change and progress could be achieved by learning from the successes and failures of others. Hence the importance of exchanges of experience such as had taken place at the Tripartite Advisory Meeting among persons who had great experience and sufficient honesty to criticise or stress certain aspects of their own countries' activities.

The Clerk of the Governing Body announced a correction to paragraph 82 of the report. In the fourth sentence of that paragraph, which summarised the statement of the Employer participant from Ireland, the words "public sector" should read "private sector".

Mr. Siktanc (Government, Czechoslovakia) said that the statement in paragraph 8 of the Meeting's conclusions to the effect that "the social guarantee, which some market economy and centrally planned economy countries have introduced, should be seen as a declaration of intent rather than a guarantee in the formal legal sense" was not correct as far as the planned economy countries were concerned because in those countries training and employment were guaranteed by law. The text of that paragraph should therefore be amended.

In addition, he regretted that the conclusions did not adequately reflect the basic arguments put forward by some of the participants, who had stressed that the problem of youth unemployment stemmed mainly from the overall lack of jobs, as pointed out for example in paragraph 25 of the report. Therefore, the conclusions distorted the problem somewhat, and while all the measures and programmes they advocated were interesting and sometimes well conceived, they could not solve the basic problem of unemployment which did not only concern young workers but the whole of the working population.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) supported the remarks made by Mr. Ducray in his very comprehensive presentation of the report of the Meeting and underlined the importance and timeliness of examining the problem of youth
unemployment. According to an OECD study, the average youth unemployment rate in the industrialised countries stood at 17.7 per cent, and in some reached 25 per cent or even more than 40 per cent. If this situation continued, it could have extremely serious consequences, not only by creating a sharp division among workers as regards employment and wage rights, but also in terms of the effect it could have on the democratic fabric of societies and the link between youth unemployment and delinquency.

For those reasons, it was important to give the maximum follow-up to the recommendations of the Meeting which had, moreover, been the only ILO activity specifically organised in the context of the International Youth Year. The proposals for future ILO action made in paragraphs 25 to 28 of the Meeting's conclusions, although not being very demanding, contained some useful ideas, particularly for the preparation of the discussion of the problems of young workers at the Conference in 1986 and also in view of the Committee on Employment or similar arrangements which the Governing Body might establish in response to the 1984 Conference Resolution concerning employment policy, so as to enable the ILO to follow world employment problems on a more systematic basis. On behalf of the Workers' group, he supported the points for decision in the Office paper.

Mr. Georget (Employer, Niger) pointed out that the problem of the integration of youth into working life concerned the developing countries just as much as the industrialised countries. The developing countries were lagging behind from the point of view of industrialisation but were forging ahead as regards literacy and training programmes. This resulted in a serious problem of unemployment affecting educated people, who could not find work corresponding to the skills for which they had been trained, and it could have a destabilising effect on the economic and social structure of their countries.

The questions discussed in the report of the Meeting, such as youth guarantees and training and guidance for the world at work, were therefore of great interest to those countries. As regards migrant workers from developing countries, who were presently subjected to harsh treatment in many countries, it should be remembered that such migrants had made an important contribution to the reconstruction of Europe in the post-war period. He hoped that the Director-General would consider convening a similar meeting for the developing countries so as to help them find equivalent solutions to the problems facing them in connection with the integration of youth into working life.

Speaking on behalf of the Employers' group, Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) considered that the Meeting had been useful and had held discussions of a high standard, in which the Employer participants had made a considerable input. Mr. Ducray deserved thanks for the able manner in which he had chaired its proceedings.

He hoped that the report of the Meeting would have an influence on the Conference discussions in 1986.

The Meeting had worked under considerable time pressure and its conclusions were somewhat general, which had enabled them to secure general acceptance. He could not agree to the Governing Body amending the conclusions of a meeting of experts, as proposed by Mr. Siktanc, since the Meeting had adopted the conclusions as contained in the report after having accepted a number of amendments. Those who had subscribed to those conclusions included three Government participants and one Worker participant from Socialist countries, and the fact that the text did not satisfy them in retrospect could not alter the situation.
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Mr. Soubbotine (Worker, USSR) found the conclusions and recommendations of the Meeting interesting and considered that they would be useful in preparing the Conference discussion on young workers. Referring to paragraphs 33 to 35 of the report, he noted that participants from the Federal Republic of Germany, Norway and Austria had rejected the notion of an employment guarantee for young people entering the labour market as not being economically viable, and this extreme attitude was based on the fact that the market was governed by competing forces and that one could not guarantee employment for a particular category of workers. On the other hand, the participants from the USSR, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Czechoslovakia pointed out that the Socialist countries did not have a youth unemployment problem; they had no employment market, but an overall plan for the utilisation of labour resources. Unlike in the western countries, there was no problem for young people to find a job as employment was guaranteed, although problems might arise in the choice of profession as several factors including the interests of the young, the needs of society and the adaptation of young people to their working environment had to be taken into account. This distinction should have been made clearer in the conclusions of the Meeting.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) joined previous speakers in considering the report of the Tripartite Advisory Meeting to be highly important for the ILO’s future activities for young people. In many countries of the world, there were not sufficient training and employment opportunities for youth. The ILO should take into account the views and positive experience of the countries which had participated in the Meeting when preparing the document on young workers' problems for the Conference. He did not object to the conclusions reached by the Meeting nor to the recommendations in the Office paper. However, as had been pointed out by Mr. Lindner, those conclusions had been adopted somewhat hastily, and he agreed with the Government representative of Czechoslovakia regarding the shortcomings in this text. In the Socialist countries, including the USSR, the social guarantees for young people were not an empty notion, and a guaranteed right to employment was enshrined in the USSR Constitution.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) had been under the impression that everyone had welcomed the initiative of convening this Meeting and that there had been a common will in all three groups to take part in a joint search for solutions with a view to integrating young people into working life. One of the most important points which had been agreed upon - as reflected in paragraph 9 of the Conclusions - was the need to avoid any possibility of discrimination and to stress that the world of employment was a single whole into which young people should be integrated as full members. In view of the importance of these problems, this was not the right occasion on which to indulge in propaganda and to reopen discussion on the texts adopted by the Meeting. For his part, he had been disturbed by some of the arguments regarding part-time work for disadvantaged young people put forward in paragraph 96 of the report and would have preferred this issue to have been viewed in a broader perspective.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Bolin, Deputy Director-General), replying to the discussion, expressed appreciation to Mr. Ducray for his outstanding chairmanship of the Meeting and very thorough presentation of its results. The exchange of views which had taken place among participants from different countries would prove very useful in preparing the Conference discussion on youth problems in 1986. It should be remembered that the Meeting had been convened in response to a request made by the Third European Regional Conference in 1979 and participation had therefore been limited to the industrialised countries. However, he shared Mr. Georget's view that the problems discussed by the Meeting equally concerned the developing countries.
and the discussion that would take place at the International Labour Conference and the conclusions resulting therefrom would certainly place the issue in a wider perspective.

He agreed with Mr. Ducray that the time and staff resources available had been too limited to do full justice to the very interesting topics discussed by the Meeting. It was hoped that this situation could be improved at future meetings.

Finally, the comments made by Mr. Siktanc and Mr. Koudriavstev about paragraph 8 of the Conclusions would be reflected in the minutes of this sitting.

The Chairman associated himself with the thanks addressed to Mr. Ducray for the able manner in which he had conducted the work of the Meeting, as well as the very thorough statement he had made in presenting its report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the Office paper.

The sitting closed at 4.55 p.m.
The sitting opened at 10.40 a.m., with Mr. Oechslin in the Chair.

EIGHTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Tripartite Symposium on Employment, Trade, Adjustment and North-South Co-operation*

(Geneva, 1-4 October 1985)

Speaking on behalf of the Employers, Mr. Katz (Employer, United States), who had been one of the participants in the symposium nominated by the Employers' group, pointed out that the symposium had broken new ground for the ILO in dealing with the employment creation problem in the real context of national and international macro- and micro-economic policies. Secondly, the meeting had worked on the basis of a stimulating paper that had helped to provoke an interesting discussion, despite certain shortcomings. From the standpoint of the industrialised countries, the paper had betrayed a nostalgia for Keynesian solutions that advocated public spending as a means of solving unemployment. As far as the developing countries were concerned, there had been two sources of disappointment. In the case of the newly industrialising countries, the paper had shown a strong preference for government intervention in the economy, although it recognised that those countries that had resorted to market-oriented, export-oriented solutions were dealing better with their problems than those which preferred import-substitution strategies and heavy government intervention, as shown by the four case studies set out in the paper. But perhaps the strongest disappointment for the Employers from the developing countries had stemmed from the inadequate attention paid to the employment problems of the least developed countries.

The discussion had been marked by a good deal of give and take, especially between the Employers' group and the Workers' group, and had been conducted in a spirit of frankness and openness to ideas as could be seen from the report of the meeting, and in particular paragraph 48, which was a negotiated text containing broadly agreed conclusions and setting forth a number of important ideas for the employment creation problem facing the ILO. All parties to the symposium had recognised the interdependence not only of countries but also of national and international policies aimed at facilitating adjustment and structural adaptation to rapidly changing market conditions. The recommendations in paragraph 48 foreshadowed the elements of the integrated strategy for growth proposed by the United States Secretary of the Treasury at the Seoul meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to deal with the debt problem.

Finally, while the symposium had dealt in an integrated way with the major actors in the world economy - the industrialised democracies and the newly industrialising countries - it had never adequately come to grips with the employment problems of the least developed, poorest countries not fully integrated into the world economy, particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa,

1 See also sixth sitting.
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and if there was one lesson to be learned from the symposium, it was that the employment problem was of concern to all countries of the world and could not be limited artificially.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) observed that no members of the Governing Body Workers' group had taken part in the symposium, and the group was not therefore in a position to analyse this report in the same way as the Employers had done. As Mr. Muhr had already indicated, it would be desirable in future to have a closer look at the system of appointing participants in meetings so that they did not become de facto subcommittees of the Governing Body.

The Workers questioned whether this could really be called a North-South symposium, since the employment situation in industrialised countries appeared to have been discussed at much greater length.

The views of the Worker participants were set forth in paragraph 38 and those of the Employers in paragraph 46. In the summary contained in paragraph 48, there were a few points to which the Workers attached special importance. First of all, the symposium had recognised that high rates of unemployment were the main problem in the present economic situation. It had also emphasised that due to the growing interdependence of the world economy, the possibilities for solving the employment problem through national strategies were limited, and international co-operation was therefore indispensable. Attention had also been drawn to a number of trends which had made the resolution of the employment problem more difficult, including inter alia high interest rates and the burden of servicing international debt, which weighed particularly heavily upon developing countries. The Workers approved the priorities for national and international action listed in subparagraph 4 of paragraph 48.

Finally, the symposium had stressed the importance of consultation and co-operation between governments and employers' and workers' organisations, and requested the ILO to pursue its investigation of the problems faced by countries at all levels of development with a view to influencing national and international policies in the direction of employment. If, as he assumed, the conclusions of the symposium were incorporated in the documentary material the Office would be preparing for the high-level meeting scheduled for November 1986 in which representatives of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund would be taking part, the Workers believed that the scope of the report should be broadened to bring out more clearly the social implications and the need for further social progress as well as the fact that, whatever the economic circumstances, it was important to observe the principles and standards of the ILO.

He wished to draw special attention to subparagraph 4(ii) of paragraph 48. While appreciating that this text was a negotiated compromise, the workers felt that it was unacceptable as it stood, especially the passage referring to the need for a better relationship between productivity and the level and growth of real wages. This was a widely discussed topic in all countries, but experience in recent years seemed to show that moderation in wages did not necessarily increase job opportunities. As indicated by the OECD in its report, "Economic Outlook for 1985", the link between real wages and employment which seemed so evident in theory had been difficult to verify. A few years ago the OECD had been advising the workers that if they accepted cuts in real wages this would enable additional jobs to be created, but this had not proved to be the case, and in fact unemployment was still rising in industrialised countries. On the other hand, as the Workers had been pointing out for some years, experience had shown that additional jobs could be provided as a result of a reduction in working hours. This was an important factor which should not be overlooked when discussing the link between productivity and real wages.
The report also referred to flexibility, but flexibility in the framing and application of international labour standards and flexibility on the labour market were entirely different concepts. The Workers hoped that the Office would take all these comments into account in preparing for the high-level meeting to be held next year.

Mr. Bhatnagar (Government, India) said that, in the opinion of his Government, the subject covered by this symposium was of such cardinal importance that it deserved further and more detailed discussion either in the Governing Body at its next session or in one of its committees. The symposium itself had been disappointing inasmuch as it failed to address some key issues of concern to developing countries. Given the diversity in the size, population and economic development of developing countries, conclusions based on experience in only four such countries could hardly be expected to be applicable to all the others. It was preferable to continue to seek guidance from the far-reaching and detailed discussions on employment policy which had taken place at the Conference in 1983 and 1984, and which reflected the views of all ILO constituents.

As one Government invited to the symposium had failed to participate, he wondered why the Office did not nominate another Asian developing country in its place.

Interdependence should not be interpreted in the sense of competition between North and South. Unemployment in the North was mainly attributable to automation and new technology rather than to imports from the South, as was sometimes claimed by protectionist lobbies in the North. What the developing countries needed was development and not adjustment. Adjustment measures in the North would promote development in the South. But the present policies of some developed countries were impeding even the normal process of adjustment. Fair labour standards could not be imposed on developing countries. What they needed was the restructuring of the international economic system and the tackling of debt problems on a long-term basis so that higher living standards could become accessible to the working population. The symposium had not sufficiently addressed the very serious consequences of debt problems facing developing countries and the drying up of development assistance. These were basic issues underlying the present crisis.

The economic policies followed in some large economies might have global repercussions, and needed to be discussed. Market-oriented policies were not a panacea for the problems of developing countries. Economic assistance to these countries should not be made conditional upon the adoption of such policies, which should be left to the discretion of national governments. In many cases an unbridled market-oriented approach had led to even worse results in terms of poverty and unemployment.

Account did not appear to have been taken in the conclusions of the role of government in developing countries where it became necessary to provide centralised direction in development policy and planning. India had just launched its seventh Five-Year Plan covering the period 1985-90. This Plan, which represented a balanced approach to the problem of management of the economy so as to cater to the needs of a vast population with wide disparities in income levels, stressed the need for programmes on a centrally sponsored basis. It also recognised the fact that both the public sector and the private sector were complementary and had an expanding role to play. Against this background, it was hardly right to suggest that ensuring responsiveness to market forces went hand in hand with less reliance on centralised government policy and planning.
Although paragraph 47 of the report rightly stated that protectionism was cowardly and selfish and that a solution based on complementarity and solidarity had to be found in order to deal with the whole problem, there was unfortunately nothing in the report to define these concepts of complementarity and solidarity. The feeling in developing countries was that far too much time had elapsed in the search by the international community for a solution to the present iniquitous world economic order which had made the rich richer and the poor poorer. Was it beyond the international community to find a just and fair economic order that would meet the aspirations of the vast majority of human beings who inhabited the developing countries? In the opinion of his Government, the ILO was a most appropriate forum for considering the pursuit of an economic order which would be fair to the developing countries.

In subparagraph 4(v) of paragraph 48 it was stated that the pursuit of sound policies taking into account the situation in internal and international markets should be intensified to encourage investment, employment and development in developing countries. Did this mean that priorities in national development had to be subordinated to the monetary policies of developed countries and that all economic developments had to be suited to the trade requirements of those countries?

For all these reasons he considered that the report required detailed examination before the Governing Body could take a final stand on it. The recommendations in paragraph 5 of the Office paper were therefore premature.

Mr. Gallegos López (Government, Mexico) underlined the importance of this symposium in view of the future work of the Governing Body Committee on Employment and the high-level meeting to be held in 1986.

However, the choice of the four countries selected for the case studies placed before the symposium (Brazil, the Republic of Korea, Mexico and Singapore) was questionable. The paper submitted by the Office to the meeting had taken the year 1970 as the basis for a rather arbitrary classification of some countries as being newly industrialising countries. In Mexico, - and similarly Brazil - the industrialisation process had begun long before that, and the economic problems the country was facing were attributable to other causes. As a result the debate had been weak and repetitive and had failed to match the complexity and importance of the subject. As Mr. Bhatnagar had pointed out, the conclusions could not be applied to all countries, and they could not even be applied to Mexico; his country should never have been selected in the first place.

Secondly, as concerns the bearing the symposium had on the future work of the Committee on Employment, it had been suggested during the discussions on the setting up of this Committee that its terms of reference should cover two topics, one of which was the generation of unemployment. However, no attempt had been made at the symposium to get to the root of the problems which led to unemployment.

The symposium had minimised the importance of the international debt problem for some developing countries and its implications not so much for employment creation as for the generation of unemployment. Both the report of the symposium and the paper which had been put before it for discussion had thus failed to meet the wishes of the developing countries for a thorough debate of the problems of unemployment and employment in an appropriate forum. The Office should in future be more careful in selecting countries for study and in considering the conceptual framework in which economic and development problems were dealt with in some countries.
It was to be hoped that the problem of unemployment in the developing countries, ignored by the symposium, would henceforth be given the attention it deserved in the new Committee on Employment, so that similar exercises in the future would achieve results of benefit not only to one or two developing countries but to the vast majority of them, since, however much they might differ, they all shared problems of the same kind.

Mr. Crespo Rodas (Government, Bolivia) had found the report and many of its conclusions very interesting. It was undoubtedly an important document, both because of what it said explicitly and of what had to be read between the lines. In his opinion, one aspect which had not at all been mentioned in the report, namely South-South co-operation and South-East co-operation, should be considered as an item for future discussion.

South-South co-operation was a fairly recent phenomenon, and it involved primarily the least developed countries of all. This distinction was important, and he too considered that the symposium should have called for co-operation among these least developed countries. Such co-operation was to their advantage as it enabled their industries, which were not sophisticated enough to be competitive in major world markets, to place their products in countries at a similar level of development. Since these industries were labour-intensive, this led to an increase in employment and was therefore of importance to the ILO.

South-East co-operation was also a new development, still in its infancy but gathering momentum. It was based on the barter system, to which recourse was increasingly being had owing to the shortage of ready cash in most developing countries.

The Worker Vice-Chairman of the symposium was quoted in paragraph 38 of the report as having called for the restructuring of commercial debt towards longer-term, low-interest loans or complete cancellation, which would match the countries' ability to pay while maintaining economic and social progress. This was a very important point which was perhaps not strictly within the competence of the ILO, but which had to be taken into account because of its bearing on economic development and thereby on employment.

Mr. García García (Government, Venezuela) expressed the view that efforts of this kind were to be encouraged. The present international economic crisis had been particularly disastrous for the developing countries, rendered more vulnerable by their heavy debt burden and the deterioration in their international trade, largely because of the fall in the prices of certain staple commodities and the protectionist barriers set up by industrialised countries, which made it even more difficult for developing countries to cope with their huge debts by denying them access to markets for their exports. The developing countries considered that they must be allowed to export under favourable conditions if they were to be able to meet their commitments, as they were struggling to do at the cost of great sacrifices and a lowering of the standard of living of their population.

Many and varied efforts had been made by the international community to bring about a significant change in international economic relations, without success. Venezuela had never failed to co-operate in any such endeavours, and had offered its unreserved support for the idea of economic co-operation among developing and developed countries, on the understanding that it was not intended to replace the more usual type of economic co-operation between developing and developed countries, nor release the developed countries from their commitments towards the developing countries.
The effects of the world crisis were felt more keenly by the developing countries. Some suffered more than others, but they all had to cope with great difficulties: political instability, growing unemployment, a progressive decline in real wages, galloping inflation, a deficit in the balance of payments and a huge international debt. At the 71st Session of the International Labour Conference the Venezuelan Minister of Labour had repeated his country's appeal to the ILO to bring its whole weight to bear on the international financial institutions in order to bring about a drastic change in their policy to make it more flexible and more humane. He also drew the attention of the industrialised countries to the imperative need to modify their present protectionist policy, which was simply making the present crisis worse. His Government called on the Governing Body to continue to give close attention to these matters of such vital importance to the international community.

Mr. Albalate Lafita (Government, Spain), who had participated in the symposium, drew attention to serious shortcomings in the layout of the report. The speakers in the general discussion had not spoken in the order indicated in the report, and the space allotted to them in the report was not proportionate to the weight of their arguments. Furthermore, the report did not highlight sufficiently the opinions of the Government participants in the symposium, whose comments were not identified and were mixed up with those made by the Employers or the Workers.

Secondly, as concerns the pattern followed in the discussions, each item had been introduced by a lengthy dissertation which resembled more the presentation of a thesis than an introductory statement, and the symposium then had to discuss to what extent it could accept these theses.

Thirdly, due account had not been taken of the most recent work done by other international organisations, and in particular the reports prepared for and proceedings of the 31st Session of the Board of UNCTAD, which had taken place in September 1985, and the latest annual report of the OECD. A representative of the OECD had, however, addressed the symposium on the employment outlook and had quoted some very discouraging figures: a forecast of 31.5 million unemployed in the 24 countries of the OECD, or 8.5 per cent of the economically active population. Likewise no mention had been made of the fact that 10.5 million young people were jobless in the countries in question.

Fourthly, insufficient information was available about recent economic developments which might have modified the pattern of the report. Nothing was said in the report, for instance, about the references made by some speakers to the consultations among the Group of Five regarding the exchange rate system, or the global evaluation of that system, or the reduction in interest rates that might result from this concerted policy, or the first reactions to the Baker Plan submitted to the International Monetary Fund.

Fifthly, the papers submitted to the symposium had dealt with the question of the newly industrialising countries in a very conventional way, classifying countries into industrialised, newly industrialising, developing and least developed countries, without taking any account of their individual characteristics. The report made no mention of the fact that in industrialised countries there were depressed areas with employment and development problems that deserved consideration, although this point was made at the symposium.

A sixth aspect not brought out in the report, although strong opinions had been expressed on it, was the bearing on unemployment of the problem of servicing debts, or even the need for disarmament in the view of one participant.
The conclusions in paragraph 48 represented only a minimum starting point, and there was a need for follow-up if the report was to have any real significance. This required on-going co-operation with other organisations, especially those working in the economic field such as UNCTAD, GATT, the OECD, the FAO, the IMF and the World Bank. The ILO could not permit itself to ignore what was being done elsewhere in the field of employment and the body particularly responsible for this follow-up would be the new Committee on Employment. He had drawn attention at the symposium to an initiative now under consideration for the setting up of an International Committee on Employment. This initiative had arisen out of proposals made by the Minister of Foreign Trade of Finland in Strasbourg in 1984 and subsequently developed at meetings of the OECD and EFTA, and had been further discussed at the Fifth Congress of the European Trade Union Confederation in May 1985. The idea was to set up a kind of working group of wise men similar to the Brandt Commission; this was a form of international action that should be linked up in some way with the ILO's activities.

For all these reasons, the report as it now stood was unsatisfactory as a working paper for the high-level meeting to be convened by the ILO in 1986. Irrespective of the outcome of that meeting, this document should in due course be placed before the Governing Body Committee on Employment.

Mr. Peterson (Government, United States) pointed out that the contents of paragraph 48 should not be regarded as formal conclusions since in fact they were merely considerations on which there had been a broad measure of agreement. He was sure that any attempt to draft formal conclusions would have resulted in even broader disagreement, in view of the complexity of the economic problems involved. The symposium had found certain evidence of a widening recovery, and, what was perhaps more important, the necessary capacity for adjustment in the dynamic market-driven economies, and while no attempt had been made to offer policy prescriptions, there had certainly been an enthusiastic and candid debate on the merits of various policy elements. To some extent it had been realised that the particular examples selected were not intended to be broad models covering all the possibilities but to serve as a point of departure for the debate which took place.

There had also been an awareness that there were certain risks attached to government interventions because of the unintended consequences that might arise from attempts by governments, however well-intentioned, to concern themselves in various ways with the objective of job creation.

Like other speakers he hoped that the ILO would carefully consider the work being done by the OECD and other economic bodies, which was of direct relevance in so far as it also had to do with adjustment, the need for flexibility and understanding of the relationship of flexibility to certain rigidities.

Reference had been made to United States unemployment figures, but it should be borne in mind that more than eight million new jobs had been created over the past five years, so that while unemployment rates might remain fairly constant, they should be viewed in the context of an overall growth in the workforce.

In his opinion the symposium had resulted in a frank recognition of the role of open and two-way trade on a multilateral basis which sought to avoid the pitfalls of protectionism.

His Government agreed with the points for decision. The report deserved wider circulation, though it should be noted for the record that the symposium
did not adopt conclusions but identified certain considerations that might be useful and serve as a worthy point of departure for further discussion.

Mr. Wang (Government, China) found the report of the symposium highly interesting. It was gratifying that the ILO had been able to convene, with the support of the Netherlands Government, a meeting on such an important and urgent subject. Although there had been some signs of economic recovery in some areas in recent years, the overall world economic situation continued to deteriorate. As pointed out in the report, this had had particularly serious consequences for the developing countries, which suffered from the effects of trade protectionism and a heavy burden of debt. At the same time, the level of international aid to those countries remained stagnant. It was clear that the existing international economic order could no longer meet the development needs of those countries, and in turn the state of poverty in the developing countries affected economic recovery in the industrialised countries. Without proper development of the countries in the South, the outlets for the capital and commodities of the North would be limited. The report rightly stressed North-South interdependence, and that was why the promotion of North-South dialogue was considered to be urgent by foresighted people. The Government of China fully agreed with proposals made in various international agencies for the establishment of a fair and reasonable international economic order including measures to raise and stabilise the prices of primary products, to reduce and eliminate protectionism against the developing countries and to seek to solve the debt problem through concerted action by the creditor and debtor nations. However, these ideas had not been fully reflected at the symposium. The ILO, which had made its contribution towards promoting North-South co-operation, should not slacken its efforts even though the North-South dialogue was currently in a stalemate. In order to mobilise international public opinion and to break the present deadlock, his Government hoped that the ILO would pursue its research work on these issues, so as to prepare itself thoroughly for the high-level meeting to be held in 1986 and ensure the successful outcome of that meeting. It would also be desirable to organise, if possible, further symposia of this kind.

Mr. Derbi (Government, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) considered that the issues of employment, trade and adjustment discussed at the symposium were important for all countries, although national situations differed widely and no radical solutions had yet been found to the problems arising from unemployment, poverty and certain economic measures. He agreed with the speakers who had expressed the view that the symposium had not tackled those issues fully and that its report did not truly reflect all the problems that the developing countries, and particularly those of Africa, were facing. The subject-matter of the meeting was also closely linked to other factors, such as the nature of the political and economic systems prevailing in various countries as well as national economic measures that did not always take social aspects into account. The conclusions in paragraph 48 of the report were inadequate and offered no radical solutions to the existing problems. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya held particular views about trade, employment and adjustment policies and its own policies were based on concrete realities and constantly adjusted in the light of practical experience. It considered that it was first necessary to determine what were the basic needs of man, and it was vital for society to move from the stage of consumption to that of production and to mobilise the workers of the country for production, because it was only through increased production that welfare could be guaranteed for everybody.

The present-day problems arising in the context of North-South relations could only be solved if both parties agreed to discuss them with the greatest degree of seriousness and to discard their long-standing prejudices that constituted an obstacle to mutual understanding.
His Government felt that the repercussions of the world economic crisis, while having important effects on the economies of the industrialised countries, had made themselves felt above all in the least developed and least industrialised countries, and therefore took the view that the whole question should be examined very thoroughly in the light of the experience of those countries, rather than focusing on the problems of industrialised countries.

Mr. Dimase (Government, Argentina) felt that the symposium had been a rather ambitious project, as its subject-matter had to some extent gone beyond the ILO's sphere of competence. It had only partly met the challenge as it had failed to take up a number of key problems. Nevertheless it had achieved one important objective, that of promoting greater awareness of the various international problems encountered in respect of employment. In view of the somewhat unbalanced geographical distribution of the participants at this tripartite symposium, not all viewpoints were represented and the considerations on which agreement was reached were accordingly incomplete and did not reflect priorities adequately.

Nevertheless, one positive aspect of the report was the stress it placed on the negative effects of the debt burden and the need for international co-operation to solve this problem. Argentina knew from direct experience that debt-servicing imposed on the countries concerned a transfer of resources to industrialised countries on such a scale that all possibilities of capital savings were virtually cancelled and it became impossible to create new jobs. In order to pay their debts, the debtor countries needed to be able to export their goods, but they were hit by the protectionist policies applied by industrialised countries. It was necessary to eliminate measures which distorted trade in commodities so as to allow developing countries to export more commodities, and the report rightly highlighted the interdependence of all countries.

It was regrettable that the report did not lay similar emphasis on the constant deterioration in terms of trade that resulted from the continuing instability and drop in commodity prices, and this situation must also be viewed in the light of the subsidies on agricultural products in industrialised countries. Most of the market economy countries nowadays competed in some agricultural sectors in terms which made it impossible for other countries to compete, and this also had a bearing on the employment situation.

His Government would have liked greater stress to have been placed in the report on possible areas of international co-operation, rather than on national policies. For example, little was said about transfer of technology, in respect of which some specific commitments had been arrived at in other organisations. There was also only a timid reference to humanitarian aid by industrialised countries, which should be reinforced.

The statement in paragraph 4(v) of the conclusions to the effect that developing countries should pursue "sound policies which took into account the situation in internal and international markets" was highly debatable. If the policies of developing countries had to be adapted to the distorted market conditions on the international market today, without endeavouring to change those conditions, there was no possibility of improvement.

In conclusion, his Government was prepared merely to take note of the report but could not endorse its conclusions.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), replying to a remark made by Mr. Maier implying that a reduction in hours of work would have a positive effect on employment creation, considered that this argument was not
backed by proof. To the contrary, the additional costs for employers resulting from a reduction of hours of work could well have quite the opposite effect.

Referring to a statement summarised in paragraph 17 of the report, to the effect that "taxes and social security charges finally destroyed the competitiveness of the business sector and resulted in a very high rate of employment", he pointed out that the last word should surely be corrected to read "unemployment". There was also some discrepancy between the English and French texts with regard to the numbering of the various sub-items of the conclusions in paragraph 48.

Finally, as regards the high-level meeting to be held in November 1986, he requested the Office to submit a brief paper outlining the objectives of the meeting in order to allow the groups to select the appropriate participants.

Mr. Cherief (Government, Algeria) concurred with the criticisms of the report put forward by several previous speakers and recalled that his Government had already expressed some reservations at the 230th Session concerning the composition of this symposium. The report now before the Governing Body justified the apprehensions he had voiced at that time, for it focused much more on the concerns of the developed market economy countries than on the serious problems which confronted the vast majority of the countries of the South, and which had already been raised for a number of years at the International Labour Conference or other ILO meetings. It was surprising that the report made no mention of the establishment of a New International Economic Order. Before it could be circulated officially, the report should be supplemented and important questions such as the debt burden, commodity prices, transfer of technology and the role of international financial institutions and multinational enterprises should be analysed in detail.

Mr. Gebre Medhin (Government, Ethiopia) also agreed with many previous speakers that the report of the symposium had failed to deal with the key issues in international economic co-operation, and in particular those which had a direct bearing on employment in developing countries. It was clear that commodity trade was vital to the development of those countries, and their efforts to achieve stabilisation of commodity prices had been frustrated by the lack of political will on the part of the developed countries to adopt measures to this effect. The dwindling of the income which the developing countries received from the sale of their commodities had in turn led to reduced investment, escalation in their foreign debt and other development problems. The main cause of unemployment in the least developed countries, especially those of Africa, was to be found in the underdevelopment of the rural sector. In order to accelerate the development of that sector, the developed countries had been urged, without much result so far, to increase their financial and technical assistance to those countries.

He agreed with the position taken by Mr. Bhatnagar on the report and could not endorse it or agree to its circulation unless the document was supplemented.

Mr. Mehta (Worker, India) considered that the symposium had held a useful exchange of views, and its report made interesting reading. In view of the complexity of the issues it had dealt with, it was hardly surprising that the Employers and Workers had exchanged experiences rather than coming to agreement on those questions, although paragraph 48 of the report did reflect some measure of agreement on certain aspects. However, he felt that the choice of the Asian countries selected for the country studies, i.e. the
Republic of Korea and Singapore, was not a wise one, since those two countries could hardly serve as a model for most developing countries.

In order to remove the scourge of unemployment, underemployment and poverty, millions of jobs had to be provided. Investment should be concentrated in rural areas with a view to making them self-sufficient in the basic necessities of life - drinking water, food and clothing - if the problem of rural poverty was to be effectively tackled. This would at the same time help to increase the purchasing power of the masses and stimulate demand. The experience of many countries, including India, showed that raising production of basic necessities was not sufficient unless the masses could afford to purchase them. There were countries which produced sufficient food but where mass under-nourishment still existed and which manufactured more clothing than was needed, but not everybody was still adequately clothed. This lack of purchasing power could lead to situations where goods were produced without being consumed. The same principle applied to international trade between the developed and developing countries. Some developed countries tried to solve their unemployment problems by reducing or banning imports from developing countries. If the latter could not export their commodities, they would not be able to import goods and services from the developed countries, and it should be remembered that the fastest growing markets were precisely in the developing world. Protectionism thus had wider implications, not only on trade policies, but also on the basic issues concerning the livelihood of millions in the poor countries.

The symposium had rightly discussed these questions in terms of their long-term impact on employment both in the developed and the developing countries. The feeling in India was that fair terms of trade would do far more to promote the greater development of all countries than plain aid. There was a lack of awareness among the developed countries about the mutual interests and interdependence of all nations. Much had been said about a new international economic order that would ensure fair distribution of wealth and balanced development - but it continued to be elusive.

While the document did not reflect these concerns fully, he could go along with the considerations outlined in subparagraphs 5 and 6 of paragraph 48. More in-depth studies were required in collaboration with other agencies that were entirely dealing with these problems. The ILO was one of the most suitable instruments for this purpose and he therefore hoped that the Office would pursue its studies so as to create greater awareness of mutual interdependence with a view to achieving faster progress throughout the world.

Mr. Tos (Government, Yugoslavia) agreed with the comments of the Indian Government representative and other speakers from developing countries about the symposium. The important issues it had dealt with should have been examined from a much wider angle, namely the need to change the entire present international economic order.

Mr. Heredia Perez (Government, Cuba), while considering that the convening by the ILO of a symposium on such an important problem had been a step in the right direction, fully agreed with the remarks that had been made by the Government representatives of Argentina, Mexico and Algeria. It was inconceivable that in a report issued in 1985 no reference whatsoever was made to the New International Economic Order, although the latter had in fact been mentioned during the discussions at the symposium. The report placed the problems of the developing countries on the same footing as those of the developed countries. However, in developing countries, the employment problem was not merely one of unemployment or underemployment, but was linked to the basic problem of survival. In many countries, people did not have
access to employment because they were not trained but they could not be trained because they were suffering from starvation and many died before reaching the age of employment. The problem of employment could therefore not be tackled in abstract terms and in isolation from issues of production and survival. Paragraph 48, subparagraph 4(vi) of the report gave the impression that humanitarian aid would solve the problems of the least developed countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, but nothing was said about creating the necessary conditions to do away with the root causes of hunger. Similarly, the debt crisis and the problem of disarmament were not at all treated as cardinal problems, but disposed of in a single paragraph summarising the statements of two Worker participants. Yet the debt problem was of crucial importance to many countries, and it would have been useful to calculate how many jobs could be created throughout the world through a ten per cent cut in expenditure on armaments. The report gave very unbalanced coverage to the statements made at the meeting, and the conclusions in paragraph 48 could just as well have emanated from an OECD symposium, rather than an international meeting held by the ILO.

As Mr. Dimase had pointed out, the priorities were listed in the wrong order in paragraph 48(4) of the report. The first priority it mentioned was to "achieve better-balanced, sustainable non-inflationary growth among all the industrialised countries". What about the rest of the world?

This text was merely a declaration of good intentions, which did not propose any concrete solutions and fell far short of the New International Economic Order and other declarations concerning the rights of states already adopted in the 1970's. Therefore, while the report was a modest step in the right direction, it was inadequate and there was a risk that the good intentions that lay behind convening this symposium would come to nothing.

The sitting closed at 1.00 p.m.
EIGHTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Tripartite Symposium on Employment, Trade, Adjustment and North-South Co-operation (concl.)

(Geneva, 1-4 October 1985)

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) felt that excessive importance had been attached to the content of the report. The symposium had been intended only as a basis for an exchange of views, but certain speakers had spoken as if the report contained definitive positions. The subject-matter was naturally likely to give rise to a wide range of opinions, but it should not be forgotten that the main value of the symposium lay in the discussion that had taken place. The final considerations in the report might guide the choice of items for the agenda of the new Committee on Employment, as well as discussions at the Conference which might involve questions of economic and monetary policy. Some parts of the report were mere statements of fact, while others had a strongly political overtone, but the Governing Body was required only to take note of such statements. The report admittedly suffered from a number of omissions. For example, it had underestimated the importance of the demographic factor in development, and particularly for employment. In general, more concrete facts were needed: employment policy and the labour market were both undergoing great change in all countries, and the most valuable contribution the ILO could make would be to provide background information and to identify new links between different factors. The Conference and the new Committee on Employment should also discuss the impact and effectiveness of the different measures taken in different countries, as comparisons of such measures had been rare. It made no sense to talk of rewriting the report, for it merely reflected the content of the discussions. On the other hand, if some members felt strongly about the issue, then its distribution could be restricted. However, this would be unfortunate, as it contained much useful background information and should not be discarded.

Mr. Reantragoon (Government, Thailand) considered that the symposium had dealt with issues of great importance for all countries, and for this reason it would have been preferable for it to have been attended by a greater number of participants. The report was accurate in some of the assessments it made of the situation in developing countries and the inward-looking trend in the OECD countries, and he supported the considerations in paragraph 48. However, he cautioned against attaching excessive importance to encouraging greater flexibility of response among workers and employers, as this could detract from the guarantees provided by certain international labour Conventions.

1 See also fifth sitting.
Mr. Aitken (Government, Jamaica) thought that the symposium had done well in so short a period to discuss in depth such a wide range of issues. It had paved the way for a more complete discussion of the problems, and especially employment. More time would perhaps have enabled the symposium to lend greater attention to the issue of economic adjustment, and particularly to the unemployment problems that may result from the deflationary measures stipulated by certain international financial agencies as terms for the rescheduling of debt repayments. More often than not such measures failed to take adequate account of the social hardship they entailed, and countries like his own found themselves caught in a trap and facing unreasonable terms for the repayment of loans. Nevertheless, the symposium had provided a valuable exchange of ideas, and had been a worth-while venture.

Mr. Kazmi (Government, Pakistan) expressed his appreciation to the ILO and to the Government of the Netherlands for bringing about the symposium, which had aroused great interest among all member States of the Organization: this was reflected in the statements made by members of the Governing Body. However, he did not feel that the considerations at the end of the report fully reflected the discussions, but this was not a serious problem: there had been many valuable suggestions, and particularly those recorded in paragraph 46, which called for greater consideration by the ILO. Similarly, greater attention should also be given to the considerations in paragraph 4(iii) of the concluding section. The entire subject, however, deserved much greater attention, and it would be useful to produce a set of broad conclusions and recommendations.

Mrs. Molkova (Government, Czechoslovakia) expressed disappointment at the outcome of the symposium: the final considerations were vague and imprecise, and contained few new ideas or proposals. Nowhere was there any mention of the new international economic order. This and similar omissions probably derived from the unbalanced composition of the symposium, for it had not included sufficient representatives from the different social systems prevailing in the Third World. Representativity was an important requirement for the work of the ILO, a point that the socialist countries had made in their joint declaration concerning the situation in the ILO, and greater attention should be given to this requirement in future. Finally, she expressed support for the statements made by a number of Government representatives, and particularly those of Algeria, Ethiopia and India.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) considered that previous speakers had covered most of the main issues involved. However, he was concerned at the under-representation of certain geographical areas in the symposium. The world economy had between 1950 and 1973 undergone the most dynamic growth in history, in which the gross world product of goods and services had more than trebled. Nevertheless, the developing countries remained areas of poverty, and the recent recession had seen the prices of raw materials derived from the Third World fall to their lowest level since the Second World War, while interest rates had risen dramatically. The indebtedness of the developing countries was one of the most serious aspects of the present world economic situation, and current trends in trade only complicated their problems. The growth in the world economy had also brought greater integration of its different parts, but the recent recession had led countries, and particularly the industrialised countries, to abandon co-operation in order to protect their own short-term interests. This was not economically justifiable: it was unjust to preach relative advantage as the basis of international economic relations only when it favoured one's own national economy. Protectionism on the part of the industrialised countries would mean that the developing countries could never emerge from their present state of underdevelopment, and this would in the long term create an obstacle to external trade, for where there was no production, there was no employment, and hence no solution to
social and economic problems. In this connection, he wished to support the statements made by the Government representatives of a number of developing countries, and particularly those from Argentina, India, Mexico and Venezuela. The ILO should continue to study the issue in order to reach more concrete conclusions in the future.

Mr. Makoni (Government, Zimbabwe) greatly appreciated the financial support provided by the Government of the Netherlands for the symposium. However, he agreed with a number of previous speakers that the report in its present form was only of limited value from the point of view of the developing countries. It would have been preferable for it to concentrate on concrete and practical proposals to promote employment, industrialisation and North-South co-operation, rather than theories and ideologies. Nor did it give much attention to the particular problems of Africa, and for this reason he was unable to support the proposal to distribute the report. It would be useful only as a background paper. One serious omission was the lack of any reference to the economic aspects of the policy of apartheid in South Africa and its destabilising effect on the southern African subregion, which would have been a useful subject for discussion, for it showed how military aggression and hostile policies on the part of the South African authorities had forced the front-line States to invest heavily in defence rather than development. At the same time, South Africa benefited from the economic vulnerability of neighbouring States.

Mr. Katz (Employer, United States) thought that many of the comments being made by speakers reflected a political approach to economic problems, based on the belief that the latter could be resolved by political decisions. It was precisely this type of approach to economic problems that had proved irrelevant in the real world. The main need was to make national economies work and in fact to make the world economy function effectively, and this required a great degree of co-operation on such practical issues as the debt crisis, fluctuating exchange rates and international markets. As regards the four countries selected as the basis for the report submitted to the symposium, while he accepted that it was unreasonable to advance the situation in any country as a model for another, the analysis had demonstrated what market-oriented policies could achieve, by contrast with politically motivated policies. A number of countries whose Government representatives had at the present session advanced well-known political arguments were in fact themselves taking stock of recent experience and trying to improve their economies by introducing market-oriented policies, which attracted domestic and foreign investment. If some of the counties suffering a debt crisis created conditions that would attract domestic and foreign investment, their economic situation would be entirely different. The symposium had been a valuable forum to debate a number of important issues. For example, what was actually meant by labour market flexibility? What was the effect of wage flexibility on employment creation? What precisely was meant by sound labour market policies? Discussions on these subjects were valuable, and here the ILO had an important role to play - not that of the United Nations General Assembly, where the usual North-South arguments had turned into sterile repetition - but that of a forum for issues which were not discussed elsewhere, real issues concerning appropriate manpower policies that would create employment and bring hope for the future.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) agreed with previous speakers who had considered that the symposium had failed to analyse the deep-lying reasons for the deterioration in the economic and social situation of the developing countries. An attempt seemed to have been made at the symposium precisely to avoid referring to the urgent problems they faced or to the need to reinforce economic links and check the increasing dependency of the South on the North. The symposium had preferred to concentrate on such issues as opening
markets in developing countries for investment from the industrialised countries, strengthening the development of the private sector, limiting the role of the State in the formulation of policy on economic activity, and the privatisation of the public sector. While it was widely recognised that the debt problems of the developing countries placed a crushing burden on them, this was not reflected in the final considerations, and no concrete measures were proposed to resolve a problem whose gravity was undisputed. The high interest rates charged on loans, coupled with high rates of inflation, made the problem even more difficult to overcome. The basic contradictions inherent in trading relations between the North and the South had been glossed over and referred to as economic change or trends. More generally, some speakers at the symposium had tried to talk their way round the issue of the new international economic order, which merely entailed respect for the International Covenant on Economic and Social Rights. There was in fact no reference whatsoever to the new international economic order, nor to the International Covenant. In view of the comments made by several speakers at the present sitting, it would be inadvisable to distribute the report.

Mr. Marton (Government, Hungary) stated that his own country, like many others, had been affected by the current wave of protectionism and worsening of the terms of exchange. He therefore sympathised with previous speakers, most of them from developing countries, who had expressed disappointment at the final considerations adopted by the symposium. This was probably due to the fact that the composition of the symposium had not been truly representative. This had also accounted for a number of serious omissions, such as the need to restructure the world economy in order to benefit the developing countries, the advantages for employment to be derived from a reduction in arms expenditure, the harmful effects of the activities of transnational corporations, the transfer of technology, and the serious debt burden of the developing countries. He therefore found the final considerations unacceptable. However, work on this subject should continue in the ILO, and particularly through the new Committee on Employment to be set up by the Governing Body. Only such a Committee could debate such issues properly, for the symposium had clearly failed to do so. It was to be hoped that the high-level meeting scheduled for November 1986 on the same subject would not suffer from the same omissions, as this could seriously compromise the ILO's activities in an important field. Information on preparations for that meeting was therefore awaited with great interest.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) stated that the reservations he had expressed earlier concerning the final considerations still applied. The report included a wide range of views, but it was not always clear who had said what. In view of the statements made by a number of speakers, it would seem inappropriate to adopt the report for distribution, and it should only be used as a background paper for the high-level meeting to be held in November 1986. As regards that meeting, it should be fully understood that at a meeting to be attended by representatives of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, among others, the ILO should state firmly and clearly its position regarding the social aspects of the issues involved. This had not been brought out in the final considerations of the report.

The Director-General thought it difficult to derive any conclusion from a discussion that had included such a wide range of opinion. It had nevertheless been a highly interesting discussion, and the Office would try to learn what it could from it, particularly as a basis for the new Committee on Employment and the meeting to be held in November 1986. However, there seemed to have been a serious misunderstanding regarding the nature of the symposium, which had been intended merely to mark the end of a research project financed by the Netherlands Government, at which views could be exchanged on the outcome of a project which had focused on four
newly industrialising countries. In no way could it assume the role of the new Committee. Nor was it justifiable to criticise the symposium for not having discussed certain issues, for its agenda had in fact been adopted by the Governing Body itself, and was fairly precise. It had not been intended to cover all aspects of the issue. Nevertheless, it seemed clear from all the statements made that the Office had a major contribution to make to the solution of the problems of employment, trade, adjustment and North-South co-operation, to which increasing attention was now being turned. In reply to Mr. Lindner's request, he stated that he had intended to submit a paper to the present session of the Governing Body containing proposals for the high-level meeting in November 1986, but this had not proved possible, and it would now in fact be submitted to the Governing Body at its next session. That paper would contain full proposals for the composition and agenda of the meeting, and the manner of its financing. The initial plans for the composition of the meeting - seven Government, seven Employer and seven Worker participants - now seemed insufficient, and he would in fact propose that the meeting be attended by a greater number of participants. The point for decision in the Office paper could perhaps be amended in the light of the statements made by speakers, to the effect that it would be distributed together with an account of the present discussion, for despite its shortcomings the report contained a considerable amount of valuable information.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) did not think that this would resolve the basic problem, for even accompanied by an account of the present discussion the report could give rise to misunderstanding regarding the positions adopted by the groups. It would therefore be advisable to withhold its distribution until all the other documentation for the meeting to be held in November 1986 was prepared.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the Employers' group, thought the Director-General's proposal was adequate: an account of the present discussion would make it possible to record all the reservations expressed.

The Chairman thought it was clear from the present discussion that it was impossible to regard the report as reflecting the views of the Organisation. However, the question of its distribution was not clear: it made little sense to talk of withholding its distribution among governments, as it would in any case be sent to the governments of all member States as a Governing Body paper. The question therefore seemed to consist merely in whether to authorise its distribution among employers' and workers' organisations, and in this connection the Director-General's proposal to distribute it together with an account of the present discussion seemed appropriate, provided that it was made clear that the opinions expressed at the symposium in no way committed the Organisation to any particular avenue of action.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) thought it would be somewhat illogical to publish two different versions of the same report, for it would be necessary to await preparation of the minutes of the present discussion before those minutes and the report could be combined. The Workers' group was therefore opposed to the distribution of the report in its present form.

The Director-General reiterated that at the next session of the Governing Body he would submit a full set of proposals regarding the composition and agenda of the high-level meeting planned for November 1986. Those proposals would take full account of all that had been said at the present session. It should not be thought that he intended to resubmit the same report for approval. As regards distribution of the report, it would, as the Chairman had already pointed out, be distributed to the governments of member States,
like any other Governing Body paper, and to withhold it would do little to prevent it becoming common knowledge. However, if there were serious reservations to its distribution, these could be accommodated.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) observed that there would have been little point in asking the Governing Body to recommend the distribution of the report if such authorisation had only little practical relevance. However, a considerable number of speakers had objected to the report in its present form, and due account should be taken of this.

Mr. Albalate Lafita (Government, Spain) wished to record his particular gratitude to the Government of the Netherlands for the important role it had played in bringing about the symposium, and felt sure that many other members would agree that the Governing Body should express its thanks to that Government.

It was so agreed.

The Chairman then proposed that the Governing Body confine itself to taking note of the report.

It was so decided.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 5(a) of the covering paper.

NINTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Tripartite Ad Hoc Meeting of Consultants on Methods of Prevention of Major Hazards in Industry

(Geneva, 15-21 October 1985)

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) was pleased to note that the Office had already taken steps to increase its activities in the field of safety and health in industry. The Meeting of Consultants had produced a useful set of recommendations which would receive close attention. Chief among them were the proposals aimed at helping States develop better accident prevention standards, including the preparation of checklists, a comprehensive manual on major hazard control and the development of a code of practice on the prevention of major accidents involving hazardous materials or processes. The Meeting had noted that the question of appropriate international labour standards was already covered by a resolution of the 1985 Conference. In this connection, he drew attention to the last paragraph of that resolution, in which the Governing Body had been requested to lend consideration, when selecting the agenda of future sessions of the Conference, to technical items dealing with acute safety and health problems in chemical and other hazardous industries. In view of the seriousness of certain well-known recent accidents, the ILO should examine every possibility for action. The best direction for such action was still the strengthening of international labour standards.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the Employers' group, welcomed the report. However, it would have been useful for the report to have identified individual speakers making the
various proposals. The Employers' group nevertheless supported the recommendations and the point for decision.

Mr. Joedonagoro (Government, Indonesia) found the report highly interesting. It should serve as a useful basis for future activities, which should focus on four main issues: the handling of large quantities of chemicals; exposure to radioactive substances; large-scale processing plants; and the use of high pressure and temperature. Industrial hazards posed threats not only to workers' long-term physical and mental health, but also to the environment and to local communities. He fully supported the recommendations, and particularly those concerning the strengthening of tripartite involvement in safety and health activities.

Mr. Gallegos López (Government, Mexico) thought the Meeting had been productive. However, he objected to the now frequent association of the accident in Bhopal with that in Mexico City. The circumstances and the reactions to them by the companies involved were quite different: in Mexico, the state-owned oil company had undertaken to compensate the victims of the accident, even though its responsibility in the matter was unproven, whereas in Bhopal the company involved had not provided serious answers to the questions asked either as regards the technical or legal aspects of the accident.

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom) congratulated the Office on reacting so quickly to the Conference resolution by organising the Meeting of Consultants. The assessment and prevention of major hazards was a highly complex issue requiring an interdisciplinary approach. There was no such thing as a risk-free environment, for nothing was perfect. His own country had gained considerable practical experience in the assessment of major hazards, and had welcomed the opportunity afforded by the Meeting to make a contribution to the Office's programme, and particularly to the recommendations of the Meeting. The recommendations in paragraphs (ix) and (x) deserved particular attention. The Office should endeavour to maintain the pace of its activities in this area.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) congratulated the Office on organising the Meeting so quickly. The Organisation held clear and undisputed competence in the field of industrial hazards, the prevention of which was a permanent concern. The Meeting had been extremely valuable.

Mr. Bhatnagar (Government, India) felt that praise was due to the consultants for producing a highly realistic report, which had proposed a constructive approach to the problem of controlling major hazards. The Office also deserved praise for the efforts it had made to bring about the Meeting. The ILO's activities in occupational safety and health and hazard prevention were extremely valuable, and discussions in the Meeting of Consultants had been of a particularly high quality. The authorities in his country would examine the report carefully so as to derive practical benefits as soon as possible. They would do so in full co-operation with the employers' and workers' organisations in India, and hoped to be able to rely on continuing technical assistance from the Occupational Safety and Health Branch of the ILO in implementing some of the projects still in the pipeline. He supported the recommendations of the Meeting. Following the accident in Bhopal, considerable attention had been given in his country to the subject of safety and health in industry. Action was being taken at all levels, and a comprehensive review of all aspects of the subject had been carried out, and would continue on a regular basis. A great many projects were under way to strengthen the infrastructure, some involving ILO assistance. The recommendations in the report regarding CIS, the preparation of a code of practice and the establishment of a list of internationally
available consultants on major hazard control methods deserved particular attention. The report should receive the widest possible distribution. Finally, he wished to thank the ILO for its response to his Government's request for assistance in setting up appropriate systems for the control of major hazards.

Mr. Derbi (Government, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) found the report useful, and supported its recommendations. However, prevention was obviously better than cure, and industrial companies should themselves give greater attention to the problems involved. It should not be forgotten that industrial accidents also included occupational diseases, which were perhaps less dramatic but equally serious. No amount of compensation was adequate where an individual's personal abilities were impaired, and this field therefore deserved adequate resources. He supported the recommendations in the report.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) welcomed the report, but thought that the point for decision should be amended so as to avoid giving the impression that further measures would have to await the next set of programme and budget proposals. He accordingly proposed that paragraph 5(b) should read as follows:

(b) to submit as soon as possible proposals with a view to the practical implementation of the consultants' recommendations, together with the effect to be given to the resolution adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 71st Session.

Mr. M'Polo (Government, Angola) expressed satisfaction at the findings of the Meeting, which came at a time when his own Government was setting up a national system of labour protection with ILO assistance. The Meeting of Consultants had produced a useful and comprehensive set of recommendations, covering an area that had possibly been neglected in the PIACT programme. Prevention was, he agreed, better than cure, and he therefore supported the recommendations. He hoped that the ILO would also become more active in its activities to provide assistance and advice to member States.

Mr. Cherief (Government, Algeria) welcomed the convening of the Meeting of Consultants, which had come so quickly after the adoption of the Conference resolution. His Government attached particular importance to the improvement of working conditions, particularly as regards occupational safety and health. It had launched a programme under the PIACT programme, and was currently considering ratification of Convention No. 155. He fully supported the recommendations in paragraph 38, and eagerly awaited the proposed manual on major hazard control.

Mr. Albalate Lafita (Government, Spain) felt that the recommendations in paragraph 5(b) of the Conference resolution had called for more than was recommended by the Meeting of Consultants. He accordingly supported the amendment to the point for decision proposed by Mr. Falchi. Perhaps further consideration could be given to the possibility of adopting an instrument on the subject.

Mr. Vinokourov (Government, Ukrainian SSR) welcomed the report of the Meeting, which confirmed the important role of the ILO in preparing standards to offset the effects of industrial hazards or to eliminate them. The Meeting should be regarded as a first step towards providing effective assistance to workers and to populations living near to industrial installations. However, the Meeting had neglected to take into consideration the activities of transnational corporations, particularly in developing countries. The Meeting could have shed more light on the real causes of the two recent disasters. In addition to technical measures, the ILO could also
work to ensure that workers in transnational corporations were adequately protected by international labour Conventions. In giving effect to the recommendations of the Meeting, the Office should give full consideration to the present discussion.

Mr. Riikonen (Government, Finland) joined previous speakers in expressing thanks to the Office for the speed with which it had reacted to the Conference resolution. Despite rapid technological progress, major industrial hazards were not decreasing, and this was borne out by recent events. For this reason the report held particular value, and the recommendations deserved full support. It was still necessary, however, to include an item on chemical safety on the agenda of a forthcoming Conference. The report offered an important challenge both to the ILO and to member States.

Mr. Wang (Government, China) congratulated the Office on its useful work in the field of major industrial hazard prevention. Developing countries should be careful to apply adequate safety measures when importing technology from developed countries. Similarly, the developed countries should not transfer harmful or obsolete processes to developing countries, and should provide not only production equipment but also safety devices. They should also be responsible for supplying adequate expertise, particularly in the area of safety, and they should train safety inspectors.

The Chairman took it that the Governing Body approved the amendment proposed by Mr. Falchi.

It was so decided.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the covering paper, as amended.

TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIRST REPORT
TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND REPORT

Mr. Ducray (Government, France), introducing the reports, said that the Committee had examined 55 cases as to substance, reaching final conclusions in 32 cases and interim conclusions in 23. It had postponed consideration of the other cases before it on account of the lack of replies from the governments concerned or the inadequate nature of the information they had supplied. In a number of such cases the Committee had requested the Office to issue an urgent appeal to the government concerned. This applied to the cases concerning Antigua and Barbuda, Costa Rica, Grenada, Guatemala, Peru and Sudan. It also applied to the cases concerning Brazil, and a third case concerning that country was likely to be opened if the Government did not reply to the questions asked by the Committee. While it was appreciated that the country had recently undergone a significant change of government, following which co-operation with the Office had improved, the difficulties involved should be overcome in order to ensure that the degree of co-operation

1 See also seventh sitting.
promised by the new Government could be achieved. The Committee had also postponed consideration of the case concerning Malta, as certain legal discrepancies regarding the status of the persons involved required further clarification before the legal and factual situation could be properly assessed; the legal issue involved was important and could have implications for similar cases brought in future. The Committee had noted that the Governments of El Salvador and Honduras had agreed to direct contacts procedures, and a mission was now planned to those two countries in January 1986.

The Committee had been pleased to note that, as regards Case No. 1241 concerning Australia, on which the Committee had made recommendations at its May 1984 meeting, the Northern Territory Public Service Commissioner had issued instructions that the union in question should be granted equal right of access to its members and other rights accorded to other registered unions. The Committee had also been pleased to note that the Government of Chile had authorised the return to that country of an exiled trade union official on humanitarian grounds.

Regarding the cases examined in depth, he drew attention to two developments in particular. The first related to the cases concerning four provinces of Canada, and it would be recalled that the Committee had requested an on-the-spot mission to visit the country in order to clarify the situation. That visit had now taken place, and as a result the Committee had been able to reach definitive conclusions in those cases. The Committee wished to thank the Government and all the parties concerned, and particularly the complainants, for their co-operation in the matter. The mission had successfully resolved a large number of outstanding problems. Thanks were due in particular to Sir John Wood, who had led the mission, and the Office staff who had assisted him. The second involved five cases concerning Paraguay. A mission had visited that country, and this had shed much light on the matters raised regarding freedom of association in Paraguay, enabling the Committee to reach interim conclusions regarding the legal and factual aspects of the case which were simple, effective and undeniable. Mr. von Potobsky, a former ILO official who had led the mission, deserved particular thanks for his work.

Cases concerning two other countries had also aroused particular concern in the Committee. The first concerned the Central African Republic, where the Government had failed to take any of the measures advocated by the Committee to restore freedom of association, despite the assurances given to the Chairman of the Committee on Freedom of Association and the Conference Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations at a number of sessions of the Conference. The situation in that country was particularly serious, and called for special attention. The second was Chile, concerning which two cases had been examined. The first concerned a number of issues of some date, regarding which the Committee had adopted definitive conclusions even though it did not consider that the Government's replies were sufficiently accurate regarding all the allegations. In this connection it had recalled a number of basic principles, which had to be respected before it could be thought that freedom of association was respected in Chile, and here he drew the attention of the Governing Body to those principles, which were recorded in paragraph 215 of the report. The second case concerned the events following the day of protest on 4 September 1984, on which the Committee had adopted interim conclusions. Information was still awaited regarding serious allegations of the death of trade unionists and attacks on trade union premises. The Committee awaited additional replies from the Government.
The Committee had also regarded the situation in Nicaragua as particularly serious. It had not been satisfied with the replies given by the Government concerning the removal of pages from the passport of the Chairman of the Supreme Council of Private Enterprise in Nicaragua, which had prevented him from leaving the country in order to attend an ILO seminar in December 1984. Other serious allegations concerned the refusal of exit visas to leaders of other employers' organisations and the occupation of private premises. Equally serious was the situation in Guatemala, where violent events, such as assassinations, disappearances, boycotts of undertakings and illegal entry into trade union premises had created a particularly dangerous climate.

The Committee had also examined three cases concerning Turkey and a representation submitted under article 24 concerning that country. These had been treated in a separate report. The Committee had noted new information furnished by the Government, but remained concerned despite some positive developments. The lifting of the state of siege in a significant number of administrative regions of Turkey had brought little change, as it had unfortunately been replaced by a state of martial law. The Committee expressed the hope that industrial relations would improve and that freedom of association would be re-established on a more firm foundation in Turkey, and had requested additional information regarding the trial of trade union officials and further developments relating to the seizure of the assets of DISK.

Finally, he wished to place on record the particular appreciation of the Committee for the extremely hard work performed by the ILO officials concerned with drawing up the files on the many cases before the Committee. Despite their heavy workload, they had nevertheless prepared excellent working papers on a great number of cases that involved complex and difficult legal and factual problems.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) congratulated the Committee and the Office for the large volume of work they had performed. However, this unfortunately reflected at the same time the continually worsening situation regarding freedom of association in a great many countries. The Workers' group was particularly concerned at the large number of cases brought before the Committee, some of them of an extremely serious nature, involving the murder, disappearance, torture or protracted imprisonment of trade union and other officials. It requested the Office to combat such practices. The Workers' group had noted that the Committee had postponed consideration of Case No. 1327, concerning Tunisia, as the Government's observations had been received only recently and it had not been possible to examine them in depth. The Workers' group was particularly concerned at the trade union situation in Tunisia, and while it was pleased to note that negotiations between the Government and the UGTT had resumed, it appealed to the Government of Tunisia to release the Secretary-General of the UGTT, Mr. Achour, from house arrest, as well as other trade union leaders who remained in prison. The Workers' group was also particularly concerned at Case No. 1309, concerning Chile, which involved even more serious violations of freedom of association, and in particular the house arrest and exile of trade union leaders. It condemned the arrest of Mr. Bustos and Mr. Seguel, and called on the Government to free them immediately so that they could resume their trade union activities. The Director-General should continue his efforts to help improve the situation as regards these two specific cases.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) associated himself with the comments made by Mr. Ducray, whom he thanked for his comprehensive introduction. The bulk of the 241st Report was largely due to the inclusion of the two mission reports covering Canada and Paraguay, and in this connection he wished to thank
Sir John Wood and Mr. von Potobsky for undertaking the missions to those countries. The mission to Canada had greatly clarified the situation in that country, and had enabled the Committee to adopt final conclusions. The mission to Paraguay had similarly helped improve understanding of the cases in question.

He drew particular attention to paragraph 8 of the report, in which urgent appeals were addressed to the Governments of Antigua and Barbuda, Brazil, Costa Rica, Grenada, Guatemala, Peru and Sudan. In paragraph 17 it was stated that Mr. Hector Cuevas Salvador had been allowed to return to Chile by the Government, but the Workers' group had been sad to note that he had died shortly after his return. The death, disappearance and exiling of trade unionists was becoming increasingly common, and the Governing Body should be concerned with this issue: such occurrences were mentioned in the cases concerning Brazil, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Mauritania, Morocco and the Philippines. While the Government of Chile was showing slightly more co-operation with the Committee, its answers were still inadequate, and serious violations of freedom of association were still occurring in that country.

Mr. Rowe (Employer, New Zealand) drew attention to the extremely heavy workload of the Committee, which in turn meant hard work for the secretariat. The reports reflected significant progress in some situations, a number of long-standing cases having been closed. At the present session the Committee had only been able to deal with 55 of the 101 cases before it, and at the next session it would have to work hard to overcome the backlog. Something should be done to help the Committee cope with the number of cases before it.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) associated himself with the two previous statements made by members of the Workers' group. While the volume of work the Committee had performed was admirable, it was a cause for alarm, for while it showed faith in the ILO's procedures, it reflected the degree to which freedom of association was being violated in an unfortunately increasing number of cases.

The two reports, however, had not examined cases already dealt with, even where the situation in question was still a cause for concern. This applied in particular to Case No. 1097 relating to Poland. He recalled that he had himself in June 1982 initiated the procedure which had in due course led to the establishment of a Commission of Inquiry, whose conclusions and recommendations had been considered by the Governing Body in November 1984, and ought to be implemented in 1985. Since then Poland had withdrawn all co-operation with the ILO, but he understood that it continued to supply information to the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations in accordance with its constitutional obligations. There was, however, a need for a follow-up procedure on the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry and he therefore requested that the Governing Body be informed on the situation concerning Poland at a forthcoming session.

The Director-General explained that while still a member State, Poland was required to inform the Office each year by 15 October of the measures it had taken to give effect to Conventions Nos. 87 and 98. That information was subsequently submitted to the Committee of Experts. Poland had in fact submitted such a report by the prescribed deadline.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR), speaking on a point of order, stated that the case concerning Poland was not on the agenda, and it should not therefore be discussed.
The Chairman replied that, while there was no item on the agenda specifically concerning Poland, members of the Governing Body were free, while discussing general aspects of the reports, to ask questions regarding other cases that the Committee had dealt with. Mr. Blondel had simply asked whether a member State had fulfilled its constitutional obligations regarding the Conventions on freedom of association, and had not discussed the application of those Conventions by that country. The Director-General was entitled to reply to that question.

The Director-General observed that the information supplied by Poland in accordance with its constitutional obligations would be, following the usual practice, transmitted to the Committee of Experts along with the reports submitted by the other member States.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) considered that the subject had been raised in a provocative spirit. The USSR Government had on a number of occasions requested the revision of the composition and working methods of the Committee on Freedom of Association, which in its present composition was unbalanced and did not reflect the political, economic and social realities of the modern world. It was therefore incapable of performing its duties with the necessary objectivity.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France), raising a point of order, asked whether the composition of the Committee was on the agenda of the present session.

The Chairman replied that members of the Governing Body were free to make general observations on all aspects of the Committee, including its composition and working methods.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) stated that in May 1984 the USSR Government had requested the Director-General to provide clarification on a number of questions regarding the composition and manner of appointment of the members of the Committee on Freedom of Association, but the Director-General had not yet given a satisfactory reply. He therefore wished to place on record that his Government no longer recognised the Committee would not participate in the examination of its reports and would not associate itself with its conclusions.

Mr. Villalobos (Employer, Venezuela) found it difficult to understand how a member State of the Organisation could choose not to recognise the authority of a duly constituted body of the Organisation which had merely fulfilled its basic responsibilities. He wished to associate himself with the tribute that had been paid to the secretariat serving the Committee. The working methods used had made it possible to analyse systematically a large number of cases. He drew attention to the statement in paragraph 7 regarding the usual procedures for the submission of information to the Committee. However, what was disconcerting were the deliberate delays on the part of certain governments in submitting their replies: some of the government replies arrived at the Office only a few days before the case was due to be considered by the Committee, making it impossible for the case in question to be examined. Others did not submit serious replies. He therefore appealed to all governments to reply in good time to the Committee in a clear and simple manner to the questions it asked, so that it could arrive at an objective and well-founded decision. The number of cases submitted to the Committee also gave rise to concern. It was necessary to introduce some procedure to establish whether the minimum requisite amount of information was present in a complaint before the usual procedure for its examination was instituted. This would help the Committee avoid wasting time for lack of adequate information. It might also be advisable for the Office to request the additional information necessary of the complainant organisation, under the
supervision of the Chairman of the Committee. This would also bring savings of time.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) observed that the statement made by the USSR Government representative had particularly serious implications and required discussion.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) stated that the Governing Body had examined the composition and procedures of the Committee on Freedom of Association in November 1984 and had approved them. It was therefore extremely regrettable that a government should no longer wish to identify itself with the work of the Committee.

The Director-General pointed out that he had in November 1984 submitted a paper to the Governing Body on the functions and procedures of the Committee, which contained a thorough analysis of the procedure for the examination of complaints concerning violations of freedom of association.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) observed that his Government's position regarding the Committee was well known both to the Governing Body and to the Director-General. The composition of the Committee was a violation of the principle of universality, which was a key principle guiding the work of the Organisation. Representatives of the socialist countries were in effect not admitted to participate in the Committee, while at the same time those countries were expected to respect its work. As for the paper submitted to the Governing Body by the Director-General in November 1984, that could not be regarded as a satisfactory answer to the questions asked by his Government in May 1984.

The sitting closed at 6.35 p.m.
SEVENTH SITTING

(Thursday, 14 November 1985, morning)

The sitting opened at 10.05 a.m., with Mr. Oechslin in the Chair.

TENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIRST REPORT
TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND REPORT

Mr. Russomano (Government, Brazil) emphasised that his Government had always endeavoured to provide objective information to the Committee on Freedom of Association, and had never attempted to be evasive or imprecise. Delays were inevitable in the preparation of replies to the Committee's questions, for they involved lengthy administrative procedures. This applied to Case No. 1237, for the matter was still in the hands of the judicial authorities. Brazil had no constitutional provision enabling its Government to expedite the consideration of cases by the courts, nor had the Government ever endeavoured to do so. The case in question involved the murder of a trade union leader, and those responsible for the crime, a group of landowners, had been placed on trial and imprisoned. The Committee had requested a copy of the sentence handed down on them, but this had not proved easy to obtain. Firstly, the north-east region of Brazil, where the case had arisen, was at present facing severe problems of public order created by a large influx of migrants. Secondly, the federal structure of Brazil did not make the task of obtaining a copy of the sentence of a local court any easier, and there were also questions of distance to be taken into account. For all these reasons, the Government had unfortunately been unable to transmit the text of the court sentence in time for the present session of the Governing Body, but it had reinstituted the procedure for obtaining a copy, which should be forthcoming within a few days. In any case, this was not an issue of substance, but merely of form.

Mrs. Molkova (Government, Czechoslovakia) thought it was unreasonable to expect countries which were denied the right to participate in the work of the Committee to have respect for its decisions. She well remembered the arguments put forward 12 months previously to defend this discriminatory practice, which conflicted with the democratic principles and the Constitution of the ILO. It was unacceptable that the socialist countries should be debarred from membership of the Committee. There was no reason why the Committee could not be enlarged, and this would be particularly appropriate in view of the increase in membership of the Organisation since its creation. While she did not question the competence of the present members of the Committee, it should be remembered that there were also qualified experts in the socialist countries available to serve on the Committee. Her Government would be unable to take part in the consideration of the Committee's reports until the situation changed.

1 See also sixth sitting.
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Mr. Mercier (Worker, Canada) drew attention to the statements in paragraphs 4 and 5 regarding the cases concerning British Columbia. The teachers' union of that province had submitted a new case against its provincial government. Case No. 1329 had unfortunately not been covered by the recent study mission that had visited Canada. Nevertheless, new information had been supplied, and he hoped that the federal Government would refer it to the Committee in time for it to be studied at the Governing Body's next session.

Mr. Marton (Government, Hungary) stated that his Government had on a number of occasions voiced its objection to the discrimination suffered by the socialist states in the ILO, which was reflected in the treatment they suffered regarding membership of the Committee on Freedom of Association. In this connection he fully supported the statement made by the USSR Government representative at the previous sitting.

Mr. Ozadovski (Government, Ukrainian SSR) did not feel that adequate attention had been given to the numerous complaints made by his Government regarding the unfair and restricted composition of the Committee. In its present composition the Committee was unable to function objectively or effectively. His Government could therefore no longer recognise the Committee, and would henceforth refrain from participating in the discussion of its reports and the adoption of its conclusions and recommendations.

Mr. David (Worker, Malaysia) congratulated the Committee on its work. Some of the cases described in the report were horrific, involving the murder, disappearance, exile or persecution of trade unionists and others. Many governments were particularly slow to respond to the Committee's requests for information, especially those of developing countries, where most of the cases occurred. This reflected the power structure of those countries, for in many of them the government operated in such a way as to invalidate the role of the trade union movement, and the methods they used did not stop at murder and kidnapping. Could not the ILO, the only organisation in the world with a specific mandate to protect the interests of working people, do something to speed up the investigation of cases of murder and disappearance? Where human life was at stake, everything should be done to protect those concerned as quickly as possible, and more stringent action, such as sanctions and trade embargoes, seemed necessary in view of the severity of the crimes committed.

Mr. Soukhbog (Worker, USSR) noted the considerable volume of important work performed by the Committee, and wished to draw particular attention to Case No. 1074, concerning the United States. It was now four years since the Committee had first received the complaint concerning the dismissal of a large number of air traffic controllers in August 1981 and the subsequent decertification of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers' Organisation. Despite the Committee's action on the complaint, the situation had remained largely unchanged: approximately 1,000 air traffic controllers were still debarred from employment in their profession, and some of them had no work at all; others had been forced to take other low paid jobs, while still others had emigrated. The degree of hardship and mental or physical stress which the controllers had suffered - heart attacks, psychiatric disorders and the break-up of their families - was serious, and the treatment they had received was a clear violation of their human rights regarding their choice of profession.

Mr. Schrader (Government, United States) observed that the case mentioned by Mr. Soukhbog had been closed the previous year, when his Government had assured the Committee that it would continue to comply with its requests for information. The Government had honoured that commitment, its last
submission being forwarded on 23 October 1985. The Government would continue to keep the Committee fully informed of all developments.

Mr. Brown (Worker, United States) welcomed the fact that Mr. Soubbotine paid attention to at least one case dealt with by the Committee on Freedom of Association but would have hoped that the representatives of the socialist countries would take the work of that Committee seriously in general. While he could subscribe to some of the remarks made by Mr. Schrader, at least as regards compliance with ILO procedures, the United States trade union movement considered that the situation of the air traffic controllers was far from satisfactory, and his organisation was fighting to restore their right to reinstatement. The AFL-CIO was also endeavouring to reorganise the air traffic controllers and to win recognition for their union. The measures taken by the Government had been extremely harsh, and had shocked the American labour movement; their treatment amounted to punishment for belonging to a movement that was at variance with the present administration, and was a clear demonstration that the law should be changed. The principle of fighting for the cause of those who were unjustly dismissed from their jobs should be upheld in all countries, including Mr. Soubbotine's, where many people were unable to find work on account of their political beliefs.

Mr. Soubbotine (Worker, USSR), speaking on a point of order, considered that Mr. Brown was making unjustifiable attacks on a subject that had nothing to do with the item on the agenda, and requested that he confine his comments to the matter at hand.

The Chairman stated that in a general discussion of the report a wide range of comments was possible, as remarks did not have to be addressed to specific cases.

Mrs. McQueen (Government, Canada) noted with interest the report of the study and information mission that had visited her country, as well as the Committee's conclusions on the cases in question. She congratulated Sir John Wood and his colleagues for the professional manner in which they had completed their work, which had resulted in a highly lucid report offering a helpful approach to resolving the difficulties encountered. The Committee's findings would be transmitted immediately by the federal Government to the provincial governments concerned, which had full jurisdiction in the matters in question.

Mr. Mercier (Worker, Canada) considered that the study and information mission that had visited his country had given a full and accurate account of the situation in the three provinces concerned. As regards the case concerning Ontario, it should be recalled that the complaint had originally been submitted in November 1982, that Bill 179 was no longer in force, that Bill 111, which had replaced it, had expired, and that the government responsible for those acts of legislation was no longer in power. The Committee's recommendations in paragraph 122 were nevertheless interesting, especially as regards collective bargaining, restrictions on the right to strike, conciliation and arbitration procedures, relations between the government and the trade unions and the need to revise procedures for the selection of arbitrators.

It was also interesting to note that, as regards the first case concerning Alberta, originally submitted by the Confederation of Alberta Faculty Associations in September 1983, the Committee recommended that the Government take measures to repeal the provision in the Universities Act which empowered the employer body to determine the membership of academic staff associations. As regards the other case concerning that province, originally submitted in November 1983, it should be recalled that the Government of
Alberta had on a previous occasion chosen to ignore a recommendation of the Committee, and this was recorded in paragraph 131 of the report. It was therefore significant that the Committee's first finding, in paragraph 140(a), was that it considered the legislative provisions prohibiting the right to strike of several categories of public servants and hospital workers to go beyond acceptable limits on the right to strike, and the Committee requested the Government to re-examine them in order to confine the ban on strikes to services which were essential in the strict sense of the word. The Canadian federal Government should take note that this was the second time such a recommendation had been made to the provincial Government of Alberta, and should remind that provincial Government of its responsibilities with respect to international labour Conventions. Finally, as regards the case concerning Newfoundland, the Committee had produced a set of appropriate recommendations, particularly those concerning consultation on legislation affecting trade union rights, the right to belong to a union of one's own choosing, the need to compensate limitations on strike action by adequate, impartial and speedy conciliation and arbitration procedures, and the need for discussions and negotiations to resolve outstanding problems concerning the legislation in question.

In conclusion, he expressed satisfaction at all the Committee's recommendations on the four cases, and firmly hoped that the federal and provincial Governments would not only take full note of the recommendations, but would endeavour to apply them. The recommendations had also been valuable in two other respects: first, a distinction had now been clearly drawn between the government as legislator and the government as employer with respect to their duties and responsibilities regarding labour relations; secondly, it would now be possible for the Committee to refer to a set of findings on the public sector that could be applied to cases in other countries. He wished to thank the Governing Body for having sent the study and information mission to Canada, as well as the members of the mission itself for their excellent work and for the valuable report that they and the Committee had produced.

The Chairman took it that the Governing Body wished to express its gratitude to Sir John Wood and to those who had helped him in the study and information mission that had visited Canada. He also took it that the Governing Body would wish to thank Mr. Geraldo von Potobsky and those who had assisted him in the direct contacts mission he had carried out in Paraguay.

It was so decided.

Mr. Russomano (Government, Brazil), referring to Case No. 1270, recalled that his Government had submitted observations on the case in December 1984, which it had since confirmed on two separate occasions. The Committee was obviously well versed in Brazilian legislation on collective bargaining, but it should be borne in mind that, under the Brazilian system for the annual renewal of collective agreements, either by agreement between the parties or by a sentence handed down by a labour court, the case had now probably been resolved through the annual procedure for 1985. No sentence of a labour court was now likely with respect to 1984, as the matter had been placed in the hands of a specialised judicial authority. The case, moreover, involved questions of individual rights, and it was difficult to provide any further information on the case without having full details of the names of the individual workers concerned and the number of requests placed before the judicial authorities. As for the collective dispute, even though an appeal to the Supreme Court was still possible the sentence to be handed down by the Superior Labour Court would be communicated to the Committee as soon as it became available.
As regards Case No. 1294, it was to be expected that the round of collective bargaining in October 1985 would have overcome the difficulties, which would to a certain extent give effect to the Committee's recommendations in paragraph 740 of the report. In October 1985 a large-scale strike of sugar plantation workers had taken place in two major states of Brazil, and it had assumed such dimensions that the Minister of Labour himself had personally attended the signing of the agreement between the workers and employers. As regards the lack of a reply from his Government, he drew attention to the recent change of administration referred to by Mr. Ducray in his opening remarks, which would bring considerable changes in the political life of his country. A special committee had been set up by the Minister of Labour himself to reply accurately and in detail to the requests for information received from the Committee. Furthermore, the previous week President Sarney had announced his decision to support ratification of Convention No. 87, which would mark a radical change in the Government's attitude to trade union activities, entailing recognition of the most representative trade union organisations, encouragement for the exercise of trade union rights, the end of administrative interference in trade union affairs, and the preparation of legislation to broaden the conditions governing exercise of the right to strike, the end of compulsory payment of trade union dues and a general democratisation of trade union structures in Brazil in line with the principles of Convention No. 87, which would form the basis for the adaptation of this legislation to the new social and political realities in his country.

In accordance with article 5 bis of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the Chairman gave the floor to the representative of the Government of Chile, Mr. Arthur.

Mr. Arthur (Government, Chile) reaffirmed his Government's commitment to cooperation with the Committee, even though such cooperation was becoming increasingly difficult. It was made increasingly difficult by attitudes such as the response to his Government's gesture of goodwill in allowing the return to Chile of Hector Cuevas Salvador: he had died not two days after his return, as alleged by Mr. Maier, but more than a month later, and he had died of cancer. Such distortions of the truth were common in the presentation of the situation in Chile. This was unfortunate, as the Government had in the same spirit taken steps towards the full normalisation of the situation, had refrained from the use of exceptional administrative measures, and had acted through the courts of justice, which had been recognised by the Committee. The detention of Mr. Bustos and Mr. Seguel had been ordered by those same courts of justice that had also on the recommendation of the Committee detained senior police officials. Such courts were independent of the Government, which was unable to influence their decisions. It was unfortunate that the present attacks had been made at a time when the Government was amending labour legislation in consultation with employers' and workers' representatives. The improving climate of industrial relations in Chile was furthermore known to the Office. Nevertheless, his Government's cooperation with the Committee would continue, and it would in no circumstances claim immunity from the constitutional procedures of the Organisation or refuse to recognise the competence of the Committee in order to avoid discussion of matters which concerned it.

Mr. Soubbotine (Worker, USSR) was under the clear impression that the Chilean authorities had no intention of putting an end to the terrorisation of trade unions and progressive forces in that country. On 4 September trade unionists had been attacked by the police and members of the armed forces, 11 persons being killed, 22 injured and over 500 arrested. Together with the arrest and torture of trade union officials and the seizure of trade union documents, such acts seriously limited the freedom of individuals and of trade unions. To illustrate the difficult atmosphere prevailing in that country,
the World Federation of Trade Unions had sent the United Nations Commission on Human Rights a list of 34 persons exiled to the north of Chile. The other facts of the situation were well known, and he therefore hoped that all possible concrete measures would be taken in future to convince the Chilean Government of the need to respect fundamental human rights and the rights of trade unions enshrined in the ILO Conventions on freedom of association.

Mr. Timmer (Worker, Hungary) observed that the Governing Body had now been dealing with cases of violation of human rights in Chile for more than ten years. The Chilean Government had time and again assured the Governing Body that it had taken the steps necessary to re-establish human rights. However, it was evident that such undertakings were merely empty promises. How much longer would the Chilean Government continue to abuse the Governing Body's patience? It was legitimate to wonder whether a country such as Chile should be allowed to remain a member of the Organisation. The Committee's recommendations should be broadened to make it clear that the Government was being given a last chance to take adequate steps to restore human rights, and that if it failed to do so the Governing Body would be forced to draw far-reaching conclusions.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice Chairman) was pleased to learn that courts of justice in Chile were independent of the Government. Nevertheless, such courts were obliged to uphold the legislation adopted by the Government, and if the law enabled persons to be arrested for exercising their legitimate duties as trade union officials, there was something seriously wrong with the law, and the Government had the power change it. The argument that such matters were the sole responsibility of the courts was absurd.

Mr. Arthur (Government, Chile) thought that the fact that the judicial authorities in Chile had recently placed eminent Government personalities on trial was adequate testimony of their independence from Government interference. As for the law under which Mr. Bustos and Mr. Seguel had been arrested, this dated from 1958, and had not in fact been adopted by the present Government.


Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria), speaking on behalf of the Workers' group, proposed that the Governing Body adopt the recommendation in the 242nd report. Nevertheless, it was regrettable that a number of provinces remained under martial law, and that the legal proceedings instigated against trade union leaders of DISK had not yet been completed. In addition, the Turkish Government should also take the Committee's recommendations into account in its current work to amend trade union legislation.

In accordance with article 5 bis of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the Chairman gave the floor to Mr. Akinci, representative of the Government of Turkey.

Mr. Akinci (Government, Turkey), affirmed that his Government had always recognised the importance of international labour standards both for the promotion of balanced economic and social development and for the improvement of living and working conditions. It was also anxious to maintain a constructive dialogue with the ILO, and had never failed to supply the necessary information and observations to the Committee. The Committee's report would be examined by his Government, which would make known its
observations. On 12 November 1985 the National Assembly had decided to lift the state of siege in eight further provinces, including that of Istanbul, which had more than 5 million inhabitants. This would bring the total number of provinces still under a state of siege down to nine, out of a total of 67 provinces. The Government would continue to examine the situation, and as soon as conditions permitted would remove the state of siege in those provinces where it remained. As the Committee had been informed, the officials of DISK and its affiliated organisations had now been freed conditionally. The five trade unionists mentioned in the present report had not been detained on charges relating to those trials. Of these five, Mustafa Aktulgali and Ozcan Kesgeç had been conditionally freed on 30 October 1985 following a decision by the court, which had deducted the period of their detention from the sentence handed down on them in connection with a different trial concerning former members of the now dissolved party. Positive developments continued in Turkey, and the Government was anxious to maintain and promote freedom of association and the rights entailed by it, and to continue its co-operation with the ILO in all fields.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 38 of the two hundred and forty-second report.

Mr. Ducray (Government, France) emphasised that the Committee adopted its recommendations in such a way that its objectivity and neutrality could not be called into question. The Committee consisted of members appointed in their individual capacity, and they were anxious to preserve the independence with which cases were examined. In one particular case at the present session the Committee had solemnly recalled that geographical, economic and political circumstances could not dictate the manner in which the Committee approached complaints. Facts were naturally taken into account, but each country had to be treated in the same way and in a manner defined by the Organisation itself, the aim of which was to defend freedom of association in all countries. For the Committee to act in any other way would be to betray the confidence placed in it by the Governing Body. Nor did the Committee prevent the Governing Body from examining in depth all the cases it was required to consider. Remarks about such cases as those concerning Chile at the present session had shown that all three groups regarded themselves as directly involved in such matters, and had reflected the Committee's role as a body responsible for facilitating the Governing Body's consideration of complaints. The Governing Body would be unable to deal with the cases without such preparatory work, which was intended to produce useful, clear and well-advised recommendations.

Finally, he drew the Governing Body's attention to the fact that Mr. Balakrishnan, who was a member of the Committee and had served it well, was now leaving the Governing Body. His work in the Committee had been in full accordance with the principles he had just stated, and he wished on behalf of the Committee to pay tribute to him for his work in the Committee.

Mr. Diop (Worker, Senegal) asked whether the Office could provide any additional information on the situation in Tunisia, about which the Workers' group was particularly concerned.

The Director-General stated that the Office was closely following developments in Tunisia and had in the past few weeks received several complaints from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. There were reports of pressure being brought to bear on trade unions, the dismissal of trade unionists, violation of the right to strike and to publish, and the suspension of collective agreements. As no information had reached the Office by the end of October, he had personally sent a telegram to the Prime Minister of Tunisia requesting information on these reports and suggesting that an ILO mission visit the country. In the meantime a letter had reached
the Office from the Tunisian Government, and it had been referred to the Committee, which had decided to examine it in February 1986. He had also approached the Tunisian Ambassador in Geneva to help obtain a reply to his telegram, and would continue in his efforts to obtain further information.

ELEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Reports of the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee

FIRST REPORT

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 16 of the report.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) was pleased to note the financial recovery of the Turin Centre, which was due in no small measure to the efforts of its Director, Mr. Galer. It was also due to the fact that the Italian Government had in 1985 doubled its contribution, the total Italian input now amounting to more than $6 million a year. It was a paradox that the greater the recognition of the Centre's vital role in the ILO's programmes on the development of human resources, the greater the extent to which the financial burden was shouldered by a single member State, namely Italy. This was not a sound situation. It was estimated that the Centre would work at maximum efficiency if it could achieve an annual total of 90 to 95 thousand participant days, and this could not be reached with the present level of resources. He therefore appealed to all member States to help remove the financial burden from one country.

Mr. Georget (Employer, Niger) was also pleased to note the efficient management of the Centre. All those who had spoken in the Committee had expressed encouragement for the Centre's future, and the Centre was now in his opinion the Organisation's chief instrument for technical co-operation. Recognition of the Centre's importance was increasing, and this, he hoped, would result in greater financial support from more countries. He therefore appealed to all member States to help finance the Centre.

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden) stated that the Employers' group approved the recommendations in paragraph 38 concerning the budget of the International Institute for Labour Studies for 1986 and 1987. However, it should be borne in mind that some minor adjustments to the programme for that biennium might possibly be made following discussions of the paper submitted on that subject under the nineteenth item on the agenda, which would be taken up again in February 1986.

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon) wished to place on record that it was his understanding that the amendment to the Regulations of the Institute did not exclude the possibility of a mid-term review of its programme and budget.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 38, 39 and 40 of the report.

1 See also eighth sitting.
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Mr. Russomano (Government, Brazil) reiterated his support for the Director-General's efforts to diversify the sources of funding for the Inter-American Vocational Training and Research and Documentation Centre (CINTERFOR). Its programmes should be expanded so as to take greater account of the special needs and features of the region. The present pattern of expenditure did not adequately reflect the aims of the organisation. The Brazilian Government fully supported the centre, but close monitoring was necessary to ensure that its resources were used efficiently.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 42, 44 and 47 of the report.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) observed that, as regards the point for decision on the possibility of amending the Constitution so as to encourage full tripartite participation at the Conference, the decision advocated in the report left open the question of how specifically to amend the Constitution. The Workers' group was in favour of such amendment, as it seemed the only way to find a satisfactory solution. However, the procedural obstacles to the placing of an item on the 1986 Conference agenda to this effect were appreciated, and for this reason the present solution had been adopted, namely, to describe the purpose of the amendment to the Conference in order to obtain a specific mandate from the Governing Body. The issue of incomplete delegations was a recurrent problem, due to a certain extent to the fact that the poorer countries were situated furthest away from Geneva.

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Employers' group, fully supported Mr. Muhr's statement.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) was opposed in principle to the financing of Conference delegations out of the regular budget. This was not the practice in other international organisations, and would be contrary to the provisions of the Constitution.

The Director-General pointed out that the purpose of the recommendation contained in paragraph 77 of the Committee's report was very precise and at the same time limited in scope. It would enable the discussion to be continued on an issue that had important implications for the standard-setting work of the Conference in the coming years. On the other hand, it did not commit the Governing Body to any immediate decision to place the matter on the Conference agenda. The proposal went no further than seeking agreement in principle to placing on the agenda of a future session of the Conference proposals, yet to be defined in detail, for an amendment to article 13 of the Constitution. It would also permit the Office to continue its quest for a solution to this problem of extreme concern, taking into account all the views that had been expressed, and to come forward with more specific proposals in due course, so that the Governing Body could take an appropriate decision — which might involve placing a constitutional amendment on the Conference agenda — in the light of all the relevant considerations.

The Chairman observed that, while it seemed that a majority of the members of the Governing Body were in favour of the proposal, several governments had recorded their opposition to it and there was no question of forcing their hands. It would, however, be advisable to explore in greater detail the financial and other implications of financing Conference delegations out of the regular budget, as well as a number of alternative solutions including the possible revision of article 13 of the Constitution. The question of placing a constitutional amendment on the Conference agenda did not arise for the moment, as no text of any such amendment was available,
but the general opinion appeared to be in favour of not blocking the whole process.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 77 of the report.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) considered that paragraph 107 did not fully reflect the Committee's decision regarding the establishment of a Governing Body Committee on Employment. As the Workers' group understood it, the Committee had in fact decided to recommend the creation of such a Committee, but for an experimental period of two years. The only outstanding matters to be discussed in February 1986 were the terms of reference of the Committee and the timing of its meetings.

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Employers' group, was also of the opinion that the Committee had decided in principle to establish a Committee on Employment, and would in February discuss its terms of reference and the timing of its meetings.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) was somewhat confused at the procedural issues involved in creating a new Committee. The point had been made in the past that the number of committees should be limited, particularly in view of the fact that ad hoc committees also met from time to time. The Committee on Employment was intended to meet over a two-year period, and could therefore presumably be regarded as an ad hoc Committee itself. The Standing Orders of the Governing Body, however, contained no specific provisions regarding the establishment of committees, and some consideration might therefore be given to revising the Standing Orders so as to cover the creation of such committees and to govern their operation.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) was strongly in favour of the creation of a Committee on Employment, as employment was the most urgent social and economic problem of the present day. However, paragraph 107 did not reflect the decision reached by the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, for the latter had in fact decided to establish the Committee on Employment, not as an ad hoc committee, but as a standing committee that should begin work as soon as possible. He recalled that at a previous sitting many speakers had stated that the problems discussed by the Tripartite Symposium on Employment, Trade, Adjustment and North-South Co-operation could be taken up by the new Committee. While being in favour of the terms of reference for the Committee proposed by the Director-General, he had also suggested that the Committee should in addition examine the direct or indirect influence of the ILO's standard-setting activities on the struggle against unemployment in member States. In making this proposal he had considered that the ILO's standard-setting activities were its main constitutional obligation, but naturally more thought would have to be given to the terms of reference.

Mr. Siktanc (Government, Czechoslovakia) observed that a broad consensus had emerged in the Committee in favour of the terms of reference set out in paragraph 103 of the report. This should have been stated more clearly in the report.

The Chairman explained that, in summing up the Committee's discussion of this item, he had approached the issue in terms of three separate aspects: the decision in principle to set up the Committee; the choice of its terms of reference; and the scheduling of its meetings. A decision of principle to set up the new Committee had been reached. However, while the terms of reference stated in paragraph 103 of the report had seemed acceptable, it was his understanding that the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee
would in February 1986 return to a discussion of the terms of reference of the Committee on Employment and the scheduling of its meetings. Paragraph 107 of the report could admittedly have been more clearly drafted.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) considered it inappropriate to refer to the Committee on Employment as an ad hoc Committee. This had not been the intention: the decision to set up the Committee initially for a period of two years had been taken so as to enable the Governing Body to evaluate its functioning and, as necessary, make provision for its continuation in the framework of the programme and budget for 1988-89. There was therefore no a priori decision to limit its existence in time.

Mr. Szikinger (Government, Hungary) pointed out that an overwhelming majority of the Committee had been in favour of an expansion of the terms of reference initially proposed by the Director-General. It was also generally agreed that the work of the Committee on Employment should be particularly relevant to the ILO's activities. While the Director-General's statement in paragraphs 102 and 103 accurately summarised the Committee's discussions, he had the impression that broad agreement had in fact been reached on the terms of reference and that the Governing Body could therefore already have taken one further step towards their adoption. However, as it was now intended to revert to that subject in February 1986, the items on which consensus had already been achieved should be the starting point, but it would also be useful to consider whether the new Committee might deal with questions of standard setting and the need for additional standards on employment. The Committee should in any case have the status of a standing committee, and had never been intended as an ad hoc committee.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) took it that the Chairman's explanation implied that a decision was now being taken to set up the Committee on Employment, and that the views expressed by a number of speakers would be taken into account by the Office in preparing the terms of reference.

Mr. Falkner (Government, United States) found paragraph 107 to be acceptable as presently drafted. He was in principle opposed to the creation of new committees, for very straightforward reasons: the Governing Body already had too much work for the limited time available during its sessions, and the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee had not given full consideration to the financial implications of the creation of such a committee. It had not really examined the question of possible reductions in other areas of the ILO's work, nor had it seriously considered the terms of reference. The discussion had been of a preliminary nature, and in preparing papers for the February 1986 Session, the Office should bear in mind the mandates of the ILO itself and the other international agencies in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort within the United Nations system. The year 1986 would be important for the ILO's activities in the field of employment, and in particular the findings of the Meeting on Employment, Structural Adjustment and Equity in November 1986 would have a real bearing on the work of a new committee. It would therefore be advisable to await that meeting before assessing how best the ILO could help resolve a major problem.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany) observed that it was impossible to amend paragraph 107, as the report had been adopted by the Committee itself. The Governing Body was nevertheless free to take a new decision if it so wished.

Mr. Ducray (Government, France) considered that the text of paragraph 107 was not necessarily at variance with Mr. Koudriavtsev's view that the Committee should have the status of a standing committee, and not an ad hoc
committee. He had also understood that the Governing Body’s decision to set up the committee would only apply for the remainder of its term of office, and that it would therefore be for the incoming Governing Body in 1988 to decide how it wished to organise its committees.

Mr. Ozadovski (Government, Ukrainian SSR) considered that the Governing Body should clearly state its decision in principle to set up a Committee on Employment, which had in fact been agreed in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee and stated in the Chairman’s summary of its discussions. As for the Office’s preparatory work on the terms of reference of the new committee and the scheduling of its meetings, he trusted that the views expressed by his Government in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee would be borne in mind.

The Chairman asked Mr. Koudriavtsev whether he maintained his proposal that the Governing Body should adopt a formal decision on the matter.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) thought it would be advisable for the decision of principle to establish a Committee on Employment to be placed officially on record, on the understanding that the committee’s terms of reference and the scheduling of its meetings still required discussion at the Governing Body’s next session in February 1986. Paragraph 107 was not in fact set out as a point for decision and did not spell out clearly any decision on the part of the Governing Body itself.

The sitting closed at 1.15 p.m.
The sitting opened at 3.25 p.m., with Mr. Oechslin in the Chair.

ELEVENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

FIRST REPORT (cont.)

At the request of the Chairman, the Clerk of the Governing Body read out a written proposal that had been received from Mr. Koudriavtsev, USSR Government representative, for a decision to be taken by the Governing Body in the following terms: "The Governing Body decides, in principle, to set up a Governing Body Committee on Employment for an initial period of two years, taking into account that the questions of the terms of reference and timing are to be deferred until its next (February-March 1986) session."

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) agreed that this wording corresponded to what had secured wide agreement in the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, but wondered whether mention should not also be made of the cost implications of the new committee on which a decision would also have to be taken in February.

The Chairman pointed out that at its next session the Governing Body would have before it full proposals from the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, including a financial estimate, without which the Governing Body was not empowered to take a decision.

The Governing Body decided, in principle, to set up a Governing Body Committee on Employment for an initial period of two years, taking into account that the questions of the terms of reference and timing were to be deferred until its next (February-March 1986) session.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 119, 122, 123, 128 and 131, and took note of the remaining sections of the report.

1 See also seventh sitting.
SECOND REPORT

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden) drew attention to paragraph 30 of the report, and the Employers' proposal that the Director-General request the Joint Inspection Unit to review its methods of work in order that they might be more in keeping with its Statute. The Employers hoped to have a report on such a review soon, failing which they would ask that the ILO dispense with the services of the JIU.

The Clerk of the Governing Body announced that the Government group had nominated a fifth Government member, Mr. Kares (Czechoslovakia), to participate in the tripartite working party set up to analyse the proposed amendments to the Statutes of the Administrative Tribunals of the ILO and the United Nations, in addition to those named in the report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 24 and 40, and took note of the remaining sections of the report, including the statement made in the Committee by the staff representative.

TWELFTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Allocations Committee

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden) noted that if the changes proposed for the UN scale of assessments were applied to the ILO this would result in a net increase of 0.83 per cent in the contributions of OECD countries and of 0.35 per cent in the contributions of OPEC countries, while there would be a net decrease in the contributions of the European socialist countries of 0.05 per cent, or 1.13 per cent if the Polish contribution were included. He assumed that this was to take account of differences in economic development in the groups of countries concerned.

Mr. Albalate Lafita (Government, Spain) concurred fully with the views expressed by the representative of the Government of Italy as set out in paragraphs 5, 14 and 16 of the report. It should be remembered that, in addition to its contribution to the regular budget, Italy paid $6 million for the Turin Centre.

He had noted from paragraph 19 of the report that the next move was up to the Fifth Committee and the UN General Assembly. Between now and the next meeting of the Allocations Committee members of the Governing Body might wish to give some thought to whether the ILO was ready to defend its status as a tripartite organisation with a social vocation or should allow itself to be treated as just another intergovernmental organisation in the UN system.

Mr. Gallegos López (Government, Mexico) pointed out that paragraph 18 did not entirely reflect the remarks made by the representative of his Government in the Committee. Although no matters of substance were involved, he would hand in an amendment in writing so that the paragraph would reflect exactly what had been said.

The Chairman pointed out that normally the Governing Body could not amend a Committee's report. However, since the Allocations Committee had not met to adopt its report, its Chairman and Reporter might perhaps agree to a correction to the text in this instance.
Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) was grateful to Mr. Albalate Lafita for his comments, with which he agreed entirely. Mr. von Holten had rightly drawn attention to the overall increase in the assessments of OECD countries, but it should also be pointed out that the burden was not shared fairly among all these countries. As previously, some Mediterranean countries like Spain, Greece and Italy were unexplainably subjected to substantial increases while the assessments of other countries were being reduced. Paragraph 19 of the report did not record a decision but simply made a recommendation to the Director-General. In his view, it would be necessary for the Governing Body at its February-March 1986 session to give more serious consideration to whether a system of corrective adjustments should be worked out or the ILO should have a scale of its own.

Mr. García García (Government, Venezuela) noted that his country's assessment was to be increased by 0.06. While it was true that the contributions of OPEC countries were being raised, Venezuela had to contend with very serious economic difficulties. Oil prices had fallen considerably, and in addition his country was heavily in debt. The Committee should have taken this into account. He accordingly expressed his reservations with regard to this increase and would be providing more detailed explanations in due course.

Mr. Haase (Government, Federal Republic of Germany), speaking as Chairman of the Committee, pointed out that the Committee's discussions had revolved around two main questions. The first was whether to maintain the decision taken by the Governing Body in the 1970s to the effect that the ILO should not have its own scale of contributions but should align itself with the UN scale. So far, there had been no move to go back on this decision because of the administrative and personnel problems it would involve. However, under the present system, it was essential that the Governing Body should be able to keep a close watch on developments in the United Nations and be informed in detail of the manner in which the UN scale was worked out in New York. At present, the Allocations Committee had too little information about the reasons for which changes were made in that scale. In his opinion the ten-year period used by the United Nations as a basis for calculating the assessments was much too long to take account of the rapid developments occurring in the world today. However, if the ILO was to adopt other criteria, as advocated by some members of the Governing Body, it must be absolutely clear as to what these criteria should be. General remarks did not suffice; it was necessary to specify the aspects of the United Nations criteria which were inappropriate to the special circumstances of the ILO. The only practical solution for the time being was to ask the Director-General to draw attention in New York to the problems the ILO was having with its scale of contributions, and members of the Governing Body should see to it that their national delegations to the General Assembly were appraised of the concerns of the ILO so that they could draw attention to them in New York. It was largely due to lack of co-ordination and insufficient information about developments in New York that this matter had become a recurring item of discussion.

Mr. Russomano (Government, Brazil) recalled that his Government had repeatedly stated that it considered the United Nations scale to be unfair as it did not take into account the real capacity of member States to pay. The rigid application of the UN scale to the ILO also had consequences that were not entirely fair, as could be seen from the document under discussion. Latin American countries like Brazil, which were in the throes of a crisis and struggling to cope with a daunting external debt, were to have their contributions increased, while those of certain economically powerful industrialised countries in other continents were to be reduced. Admittedly, it was difficult for a layman to grasp all the subtle refinements of the
complex system used to draw up the UN scale, but its practical implications were evident to anyone capable of making a simple calculation. He therefore wished to reiterate the reservations expressed previously by the Brazilian Government in this respect, both in the ILO and elsewhere.

Mr. Aitken (Government, Jamaica) agreed with the remarks of the preceding speakers, as he also had difficulty in understanding the factors used by the United Nations in its calculations which resulted in higher assessments for countries that had for some years been experiencing substantial negative growth and lower assessments for countries whose growth might be termed positive. While he had nothing against decreases in the assessments of countries in the latter position, his Government felt that the assessment of Jamaica should take into due account the fact that the country was passing through a period of substantial negative growth.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

THIRTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

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

Mr. Tikriti (Government, Iraq), speaking as Chairman of the Committee, introduced the report. The Committee had dealt with two items relating to standing orders. The first concerned a number of proposed amendments to the Standing Orders of the Conference, none of which introduced changes of significance. One of these had failed to secure agreement and the Committee had adjourned its consideration of another to enable the Office to prepare further proposals in the light of the discussion. If approved by the Governing Body, the amendments recommended by the Committee would be submitted to the Conference with a view to their adoption at its next session. Under the second item, the Committee had held a preliminary discussion on the questions referred to it in the context of the follow-up of the 1984 Conference discussion on international labour standards, namely the procedure for fixing the Conference agenda and the procedure for the adoption of Conventions and Recommendations. The Committee had decided to continue this discussion at its next meeting on the basis of a further Office paper, but without reaching any firm conclusion until the Working Party on International Labour Standards would have completed its work.

There had been four items concerning the application of Conventions and Recommendations on the Committee's agenda. The first related to the choice of Conventions and Recommendations on which reports should be requested in 1987 and 1988 under article 19 of the Constitution. The Committee's recommendations were set out in paragraph 66 of its report. Secondly, as concerns the discontinuance of detailed reporting on certain Conventions, the Governing Body had already decided in February-March 1985 that detailed reporting should be discontinued on ten Conventions of limited relevance, subject to certain safeguards. The Committee was now recommending discontinuance of detailed reporting on two further Conventions, and would be giving further consideration to several more.

Thirdly, the Committee had had before it a paper on the possibility of simplifying report forms, prepared at the request of the Governing Body following the 1984 Conference discussion on international labour standards. The Committee was recommending certain changes in the report forms, as well as
the text of the report forms for the two Conventions adopted at the 1985 Conference. The changes suggested were intended to make the report forms easier to use and to assist governments to prepare their reports.

Fourthly, the Committee had held a discussion on the practice in respect of observations by employers' and workers' organisations as regards the implementation of Conventions and Recommendations, based on a paper prepared at the request of the Committee. In the opinion of a majority of the members of the Committee, including the Employer and Worker members, the paper showed that there was a clear legal basis for taking into account observations received from such organisations, although some members of the Committee felt that the matter required further examination and that rules needed to be laid down concerning the receivability of such observations as well as of representations under article 24 of the Constitution.

Finally, he wished to thank all the members of the Committee, and particularly the Employer Vice-Chairman, Miss Hak, and the Worker spokesman, Mr. Blondel, as well as to the Office staff concerned. Without their valuable assistance, the work of the Committee would not have progressed so fast.

The Clerk of the Governing Body drew attention to two errors in the report. In paragraph 72, the Government representative of the Ukrainian SSR should have been quoted as also supporting the discontinuance of detailed reporting on certain Conventions. In paragraph 85, the remarks attributed to the Government representatives of Czechoslovakia and the USSR had in fact been made by the representatives of Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR.

Miss Hak (Employer, Netherlands) considered that the Committee had held a useful discussion under the able chairmanship of Mr. Tikriti. The Employers were in agreement with all the decisions proposed. As far as article 17, paragraph 3, of the Conference Standing Orders was concerned, the Employers held the view that the transfer of any resolutions to other Conference committees should be decided by the Selection Committee and not the Resolutions Committee. The Committee on Standing Orders and the Application of Conventions and Recommendations would pursue its discussion on this question at its next meeting on the basis of a further Office paper. The Committee had likewise taken no decision on the follow-up of the Conference discussion on international labour standards, but, as recorded in paragraph 60 of the report, the Employers had pointed out that the question of incomplete Conference delegations was not linked to the Working Party on International Labour Standards, and work could perhaps advance more rapidly on that issue than on the other items.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) expressed satisfaction that the Committee had been able to conclude a particularly heavy agenda in a single sitting and yet managed to produce a report which faithfully reflected the concerns of the Committee. However, the lay-out of the report could have been improved by spacing out the different sections and subsections so as to provide greater contrast.

He also wished to avail himself of this opportunity to appeal to all countries to make a greater effort to ratify Conventions as the level of ratifications was a factor having a decisive influence on the choices to be made by the Committee and its recommendations to the Governing Body.

As concerns the Conference Standing Orders, a number of amendments were merely aimed at harmonising the different language versions. The proposal for the amendment of article 14, paragraph 3, had been dropped, and the reasons given by the Workers for not wishing to pursue the proposal were
stated in paragraph 11 of the report. On the question of the proposed amendment concerning the transfer of resolutions to other Conference committees, consideration of which had been deferred, the Workers held the view that such transfer was within the competence of the Selection Committee, and that any change would require the amendment of article 4 rather than article 17. The Workers had agreed to discuss the procedural questions relating to the fixing of the Conference agenda and the adoption of standards, but had made it clear that they intended to revert to these questions when the Working Party on International Labour Standards had completed its work.

As far as the application of Conventions and Recommendations was concerned, the Workers agreed with the selection of the instruments that were to be the subject of reports under article 19 of the Constitution in 1987 and 1988. They had some misgivings about the discontinuance of detailed reporting on certain Conventions, which raised sensitive issues. In agreeing to the discontinuance of reporting on Conventions Nos. 20 and 34, they had stressed the need to safeguard the possibility for reporting to be restored should a workers' or employers' organisation draw attention to a situation that would make this necessary.

In requesting information on difficulties encountered in the application of Conventions Nos. 35 to 40 before they could agree to discontinuance of reporting on those Conventions, the Workers had not intended to be obstructive, but had merely wanted to make sure that the Workers' rights would be guaranteed. They hoped that by the next session the Office would be able to give them all the information and assurances they needed.

The Workers had not been convinced by the argument that report forms could be shortened to an extent that would lead to significant financial savings, and maintained the view that it was useful for all requests for reports to be accompanied by the text of the relevant instruments, which facilitated comparison and made it easier for governments to draw up their reports. In this connection, the Workers were highly satisfied with the lay-out of the report forms adopted for Conventions Nos. 160 and 161.

Finally, the Workers felt that the paper prepared by the Office for the Committee on the practice in respect of observations by employers' and workers' organisations as regards the implementation of Conventions and Recommendations contained much interesting background information and deserved to be widely distributed in appropriate circles, as it clearly illustrated the developments that had occurred with regard to one of the practices corresponding most closely to the principle of tripartism.

Mr. Szikinger (Government, Hungary), referring to paragraph 64 of the report in which he was associated with the remarks made by the Government representative of Czechoslovakia, pointed out that he could subscribe fully to the comments made by the latter as regards some contradictions between the Office papers submitted to the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee and the Committee on Standing Orders, but that he had in fact not made any statement of that kind. Instead, the point he had intended to make related to another contradiction. In 1983 the Governing Body had requested the Committee on Standing Orders to take measures with a view to having a survey under article 19 of the Constitution on the application of the instruments on employment policy carried out. However, the Office had made no proposals to this effect, and had explained its reasons for not doing so in one of the papers submitted to the Committee. The Office thus appeared to cast doubt on the appropriateness of carrying out a survey on these instruments on the ground that their provisions did not lend themselves to in-depth legal analysis by the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations as required by article 19 of the
Constitution. In his opinion, these explanations were questionable as they implied that there were two types of ILO instruments: those that were suitable for a survey under article 19 and those that were not. But there was no provision in article 19 for any such distinction.

Paragraphs 5(e) and 6(d) of article 19 stated clearly that member States had to report on the position not only of their law but also of their practice, and accordingly the survey had to cover what was done in practice as well as the legal aspects. If the functions and composition of the Committee of Experts did not enable it to carry out such a comprehensive review of some of the ILO's most important instruments, there was perhaps a problem with the composition of the Committee of Experts.

There was nothing in article 19 of the Constitution specifying that the information supplied by governments could only be examined by the Committee of Experts. If the latter could not deal with it, some alternative solution would have to be found. In his view, a detailed survey of this kind should enable an assessment to be made of how effective these instruments were and what difficulties countries experienced in implementing them, and on that basis one could judge what assistance these countries might need. He therefore considered that the idea of carrying out a survey on the instruments on employment policy should not be abandoned, a view that had been shared by the Worker spokesman in the Committee, but this did not emerge clearly in the report.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 7, 9, 18, 27, 29, 32, 66, 73 and 80, and took note of the remaining sections of the report.

FOURTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the International Organisations Committee

Mr. Crespo Rodas (Government, Bolivia), Chairman of the Committee, presented its report. In addition to examining the documents before it, the Committee had been given information about more recent developments by Mr. Bolin, Deputy Director-General.

As usual, there had been a thorough discussion on the activities of both the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights, since the work of these two bodies was highly relevant to that of the ILO. The Governing Body would no doubt take due note of the views expressed, but no decision was called for on these matters. On the other hand, the Committee was proposing that the Governing Body should take formal note of the fact that the resolution on equal opportunities and treatment adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 71st Session and the Forward-Looking Strategies adopted by the Nairobi Conference were consistent, and also recommended that the Governing Body request the Director-General to submit to the Committee on Discrimination at the earliest opportunity the analysis of the results of the Nairobi Conference and the follow-up action that should be taken by the ILO. The importance of this Conference, whose objectives were so closely bound up with the preoccupations of the ILO, could hardly be overemphasised. The Committee was also asking the Governing Body to take formal note of the report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination as this was the regular practice in view of the responsibilities of the ACC
towards the specialised agencies as well as the United Nations and its Economic and Social Council.

Lastly, the Committee had noted that a conference would be held shortly on the law of treaties between States and international organisations or between international organisations. This conference would be discussing highly complex legal issues which should not, however, affect the constitutional practice of the ILO with respect to international labour Conventions. The Committee had preferred to defer its discussion until it received information from the Director-General on the outcome of the conference, at which the ILO would be represented.

Mr. Tata (Employer, India) highlighted some of the items before the Committee that had been particularly strongly supported by the Employers. The first was the General Assembly resolution on consumer protection. The ILO had a vital stake in this subject and was competent to deal with it; consumer prices and inflation in general could be better controlled if the consumer was efficiently protected. The Employers therefore hoped that the ILO could play a more active role in this field.

Another subject on which the Employers had agreed with the Workers was the UN Convention on migrant workers, the role of the ILO and the supervisory machinery to be established for its application. Both groups hoped that appropriate arrangements would be adopted, but would prefer them embodied in formal texts rather than merely take the form of verbal commitments by members of ECOSOC and other organisations.

Thirdly, the Employers had noted that the Constitution of UNIDO had received the required number of ratifications and that the Office would submit a detailed paper describing the form of the ILO's future relationship with that organisation but they shared the Workers' disappointment that UNIDO did not yet seem to be fulfilling the hopes and aspirations expressed at the time it was established. He had no doubt that given proper active support it might do so.

Fourthly, while discussing the activities of ECOSOC, members of the Committee had naturally referred to the United Nations' achievements during the first four decades of its existence. Not all those remarks had been complimentary, and he himself felt that the United Nations could have accomplished more had it avoided duplication and established a clear order of priority for the subjects on which to concentrate rather than trying to handle too many at the same time. For instance, proper co-ordination with the FAO might have contributed towards preventing the problems of famine afflicting Africa today. The ACC should accordingly envisage setting up a special committee to examine problems of overlapping and duplication in the work of the United Nations and its specialised agencies, each of which could prove more effective if it kept within its own terms of reference. Although subjects like migrant labour and freedom of association were properly the province of the ILO, a lot of time was devoted to them by other agencies.

Finally, he wished to repeat his earlier request that the ILO study in detail the impact of population on employment. This request was based on the conclusion he had reached that industry would never be able to provide enough jobs, in view of the population explosion taking place in the developing world and the increasing disappearance of traditional jobs as a result of automation and other technological developments. The developing countries would therefore have to look to agriculture and agro-economic industries to maintain the level of employment and eradicate unemployment and underemployment, and the ILO would in turn have to pay far more attention to these areas than previously. The problems of industrial workers should certainly not be
overlooked, but neither the new Committee on Employment nor the meeting that would examine the impact of various economic factors on employment would be able to avoid focusing on agriculture and rural workers, since only agricultural employment and self-employment could provide a long-term solution. While being aware that the ILO had done a great deal of work in this field, he urged a study to be made of the extent to which demographic developments would affect employment, based on an estimate of the future world population. This would bring out the link between employment and population which people tended to ignore.

Mr. Brown (Worker, United States), recalled the misgivings expressed by the Workers about the proposed UN Convention on migrant workers, as they were not convinced that the UN working group set up to draft the Convention had demonstrated real support for giving the ILO a role in the supervisory machinery. However, they had accepted the proposition on its face value, hoping that the developments reported verbally to the Committee by Mr. Bolin would be put in writing in due course.

As regards UNIDO, the Workers were waiting for this organisation to get under way and do useful work in its field of activity, but they had some doubts as to whether it would be possible to implement any UNIDO decisions effectively without genuine participation by the basic elements of production, namely management and labour. As the ILO representatives at the UNIDO meetings had stressed, no measures decided at the level of international organisations could be properly applied at the national level unless they were acceptable to management and labour in the countries concerned and this required their participation in decision-making both at the international level and at the national level, as was already the case in some countries. This was especially important in the case of decisions involving the relationship between industrialised countries and developing countries.

Turning to the resumed 39th Session of the UN General Assembly, he said that the Workers joined with the Employers in welcoming the resolution providing guidelines for consumer protection. The need for such protection had been a concern of the labour movement for many years, and in many countries the trade union organisations participated in the bodies concerned, both governmental and non-governmental. The Workers considered these guidelines to be particularly important as they concerned not only the protection of the consumer in general but also the safety and health of workers, especially in terms of the products they used during their work. They felt that the best contribution the ILO could make would be to assist in the application of these guidelines and to strengthen its instruments as well as bringing them to the attention of governments, employers and workers. There was an urgent need for action in many countries, especially from the point of view of safety and health relating to the use of certain products in industry.

As regards the activities of ECOSOC, the latter had discussed a wide range of questions, including trade union rights. The Workers had stressed in this connection that the ILO had its own special body to deal with violations of trade union rights everywhere, and those countries that rejected that body's recommendations under the pretext of sovereignty but accepted all other condemnations were countries that practised double standards. It was to be hoped that ECOSOC would bear this in mind when dealing with such issues.

The Workers also welcomed the recent meeting of GATT which had discussed North-South trade and co-operation. However, as they had previously emphasised, decisions taken at the international level could not easily be implemented at the national level, unless workers and management were involved in the process. The ILO had a role to play in relation to GATT and
international trade by promoting social standards, and unlike some who felt that such standards constituted a form of protectionism, the Workers believed that on the contrary it was the absence or erosion of fair labour standards that amounted to a form of protection in the international trade market.

He also agreed fully with Mr. Tata's remarks on rural employment. The Workers had repeatedly expressed their concern about the need for special programmes for rural workers as well as the desirability of developing a favourable atmosphere for rural workers to organise themselves for the defence of their interests and offering the greatest possible support for programmes for the rural population, since in many parts of the world rural workers represented a majority of the total population.

He had emphasised in the Committee that any criticism of ILO standards or its supervisory machinery should be voiced inside the ILO, and the Workers would resist any attacks on the ILO in other bodies because, as had been rightly stated by the ICFTU representative at ECOSOC, any attack on the ILO represented an attack on all workers. He also felt that ILO-UN co-operation was very important in connection with the Commission on Human Rights, and welcomed the fact that the UN was making greater use of information emanating from the Committee on Freedom of Association and the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations. This provided all the more reason why these bodies should not be criticised in the United Nations. The Workers had been very firm on this point and he was convinced that the Employers and most members of the Committee shared this view.

The Workers also welcomed the Forward-Looking Strategies for the advancement of women adopted by the Nairobi Conference. The Workers had strongly supported this conference, and most of the international trade union organisations had prepared for it long in advance in order to be able to participate in it as fully as possible. It was therefore regrettable that non-governmental organisations, especially trade unions, had not been given the opportunity of taking part in some of the preparatory committee work. However, they naturally supported the recommendations of the Conference, and also agreed with some of the remarks that had been made, in particular about the need to increase employment of women workers, including in the ILO. He recalled that during the discussion on this item one Worker member of the Committee had said that he was glad to hear a Government representative who had raised certain issues express renewed faith in the instruments of the ILO, and hoped that this renewal of faith would be of assistance to persons who had been unable to find appropriate employment in a country where, according to that representative, unemployment did not exist.

Finally, he had found the overview reports of the ACC extremely useful, especially for those who did not attend UN meetings. He recalled that at one time the Committee had been provided with a report from the Office on its input into the work of the United Nations and an evaluation of that input, and he felt that it would be useful for both the Committee and the Office if such an exercise could be repeated in the near future.

Mr. Russomano (Government, Brazil) pointed out that paragraph 24 of the report did not reflect accurately what he had said in the Committee. This paragraph should have read as follows: "The Government representative of Brazil stressed the support of his country for human rights. At the global level, Brazil had expressed in the United Nations General Assembly its intention of adhering to the international Covenants on human rights and had signed the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Brazilian Government favoured close collaboration with the ILO to protect human rights in the labour field and ensure the application of the relevant standards."
Mr. Farag (representative of the Organisation of African Unity) associated himself with the comments made by the Employers' spokesman about the importance of agriculture as well as the views expressed by the Workers on employment and industry. The OAU followed with close attention the participation of the ILO in international conferences and forums and the information it provided to the Governing Body on important international events, particularly in relation to matters falling within the ILO's competence.

The Commission on Human Rights had at its 41st Session adopted a resolution recommending the Economic and Social Council to organise in 1986 an international seminar in Africa on international assistance and support to peoples and movements struggling against colonialism, racism, racial discrimination and apartheid. His organisation attached great importance to this seminar. He was sure that the ILO would participate in the seminar, and hoped that its representatives would provide it with information about the situation in South Africa, especially as concerns the infringement of trade union rights, the persecution of Black trade unionists and the repression of the Black trade union movement, and call for the immediate release of trade unionists. These were topics of great importance to the OAU.

Finally, since the documents submitted to the International Organisations Committee had alluded to the efforts of other international organisations to alleviate the critical economic situation in Africa, his own organisation would have appreciated it if the picture could have been completed by referring to the efforts made by the OAU, particularly during its last summit meeting in Addis Ababa, at which the ILO had been represented.

Mr. Siktanc (Government, Czechoslovakia) shared the hope that the results of the Nairobi Conference would help improve the lot of women and that the ILO would make a worth-while contribution, in particular as a follow-up to the resolution adopted at the 71st Session of the International Labour Conference. His Government was ready to approve the proposals in paragraph 45. However, he wished to draw attention to the fact that the paper on the achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women, the discussions at the Nairobi Conference and the Forward-looking Strategies had stressed, inter alia, the fact that equality for women could not be achieved without far-reaching social transformations. In his opinion the Committee's report had not placed sufficient emphasis on this task, which fell squarely within the responsibility of the ILO and should be given priority in its technical assistance and other programmes. His Government also agreed to the proposal in paragraph 55.

As regards the disapproval expressed by one speaker with respect to the submission by the socialist countries to the United Nations of a Declaration on the situation in the ILO, he wished to point out that the countries in question were sovereign States and did not need to seek anybody's approval before doing what was fully within their rights. Anyone who recommended that they should seek satisfaction for their just demands within the ILO was either ignorant or a cynic. It was well known that the socialist countries had first made these demands many years ago and had been waiting patiently for results ever since.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) recalled that his Government's representative in the Committee had drawn attention to a series of points raised in the Declaration of the socialist countries on the situation in the ILO. All Government, Employer and Worker delegates at the last session of the Conference had been able to take cognisance of this document before it was submitted to the United Nations. The Declaration set out concisely the opinions and positions of a whole group of States Members of the ILO, and it
did indeed criticise certain aspects of the ILO's activities. But these should not be construed as attacks on the working masses of all countries. On the contrary, by criticising the ILO's shortcomings the socialist countries sought to improve its efficiency and ensure that its activities reflected more fully the interests of the workers. In particular, the Declaration pointed out that there did not yet exist an ILO Convention on the right to work - a basic human right that had long been proclaimed by the United Nations in the Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on Social Progress and Development and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. As sovereign States, the socialist countries had every right and reason to distribute this Declaration in other UN agencies and bodies, particularly since the ILO was part of the UN system, and there was nothing unusual in the fact that a number of delegations from socialist countries had raised matters dealt with in this Declaration in ECOSOC and the General Assembly.

In conclusion, he wished to refer to a remark made by one speaker to the effect that the Government representative of a member State had boasted that in his country there was no unemployment. If that speaker was referring to the USSR, as those who recalled a similar exchange of remarks in the International Organisations Committee might have cause to believe, Mr. Koudriavtsev could only repeat that he would be very pleased when that speaker would also be able to boast that his own country too had finally eliminated unemployment.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 45 and 55, and took note of the remaining sections of the report.

FIFTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Industrial Activities Committee

Mr. Marton (Government, Hungary), introducing the report as Chairman of the Committee, wished to focus his remarks on three subjects. First, the Committee had continued its discussions on the question of strengthening the effectiveness of Industrial Committee-type meetings. Since it was necessary to arrive at decisions on this question by consensus, the Committee had requested the Office to prepare for its May 1986 meeting a list of all the outstanding proposals so that the Committee could see whether such consensus could be reached.

Secondly, the Committee had examined the question of the composition of joint committees. The proposals agreed upon by the Committee after a lengthy discussion were set out in paragraphs 36 to 40 of the report, which the Committee recommended the Governing Body to adopt.

Thirdly, the views of the Committee with regard to the publication of reports for Industrial Committee-type meetings in Spanish were set out in paragraphs 78 to 97. At a previous meeting the Committee had recommended that reports for such meetings should be issued in Spanish if at least four Spanish-speaking countries - counting also Brazil for this purpose - were invited to the meeting concerned. This was only partially provided for in the budget, but in order to meet the wish expressed by the Coal Mines Committee at its last session it was important that the reports for its next session should also be published in Spanish, and he hoped that the Programme,
Financial and Administrative Committee and the Governing Body would be able to take a decision to that effect.

Lastly, he expressed his gratitude to the Office for the excellent preparations made for this Committee, and his thanks to the two Vice-Chairmen, who had been extremely helpful to him.

He recommended that the Governing Body adopt the report.

Mr. Mehta (Worker, India), speaking on behalf of the Workers, indicated that their views on strengthening the effectiveness of Industrial Committee-type meetings were set out in paragraph 4. They hoped that some method could be found to enable countries which could not attend Industrial Committee sessions to be replaced by countries on a reserve list. As regards the other aspects of that question, the Committee would decide at its next meeting whether a working party should be established to examine them. In the Workers' opinion the Committee itself could deal with these problems.

The Workers' views on the composition of joint committees were set out in paragraph 19. As far as criteria were concerned, they were of the opinion, which was not reflected clearly in the report, that countries which, although having expressed interest in these committees, did not answer the ILO's questionnaires or attend the meetings should not be included in the membership of such committees in future. On the question of private sector representation, the Workers considered that while it was in order for private employers to be represented if they accounted for a significant proportion of output in the sector concerned, they should form part of a combined employer-government group and the committee should remain bipartite in character. Their presence would not be acceptable in the Joint Committee on the Public Service, where governments were the sole employers. The Workers agreed with the points for decision in paragraphs 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40.

As regards the effect to be given to the conclusions and resolutions of the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers, the Workers agreed with the proposed points for decision. However, he felt that the remarks by the Employer Vice-Chairman recorded in paragraph 44 of the report were unfair both to the Office and to the Workers' group.

The Workers were also in favour of publishing the reports for the Coal Mines Committee in Spanish if budgetary resources allowed.

With regard to the terms of reference of the Tripartite Meeting on Salaried Authors and Inventors, the Workers' views were set out in paragraphs 101, 102 and 107. They had proposed that the reference to "the interests of the employer" at the end of clause (a) of the point for decision in paragraph 111 be replaced by "the interests of the enterprise", as the latter concept was broader and would cover both the employers' and the workers' interests. However, the Committee had preferred to maintain the original wording.

During the discussion on the periodic reports on the effect given to the requests of Industrial Committees and similar bodies, the Workers had made some complaints about insufficient dissemination of information and lack of involvement of workers' organisations in follow-up activities, which were recorded in paragraph 113. He hoped that in future the Office would see to it that these concerns were met.

He concluded by thanking the Chairman of the Committee for his excellent conduct of the proceedings and the Office for the support it had given.
Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) said that the Employers looked forward to receiving the Office paper to be submitted to the Committee in May 1986 on strengthening the effectiveness of Industrial Committee-type meetings. The Employers' views on this subject were set out in paragraph 5 of the Committee's report.

As regards the composition of joint committees, he reiterated the Employers' wish that private employers should be invited to be represented by observers in joint committees dealing with the public service.

Paragraph 36(1)(b) needed to be amended slightly to take account of the point already made by the Employers that the relevant criterion should be the relative importance of the numbers of persons employed, or of output, in the sector concerned within each country, and not in the world as a whole.

As concerns the Ninth Session of the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers, he drew attention to the Employers' remarks summarised in paragraph 44. They hoped that the Office would take these remarks to heart and refrain in future from incorporating its own ideas into the conclusions it drafted, which should be based exclusively on the actual discussions in the Committee.

Mr. Albalate Lafita (Government, Spain) was grateful to the Government of Brazil for its solidarity with Spanish-speaking countries on the question of the publication of the Office reports for Industrial Committees in Spanish. He wished to point out in addition that these reports were not exclusively used by the delegates to these Committees but also served as valuable sources of information and guidance for Spanish-speaking readers, educational establishments, employers and workers throughout the world. An agreement was presently being negotiated with the Office on the whole question of publications in Spanish, and this should lead to making these publications available to all those who needed them.

Without wishing to reopen the debate that had taken place in the Committee he had some issues of substance to raise on the question of the composition of joint committees, particularly as regards private employer representation in those bodies. This matter had already been discussed in the Governing Body and some of its Committees, such as the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee and the Committee on Standing Orders, where some Government representatives had spoken against the solution that was now being recommended. Paragraph 19 of the report of the Industrial Activities Committee made it clear that the Workers were opposed to admitting private employers to the Joint Committee on the Public Service, but would accept their presence in other joint committees. This was an important matter as it involved the autonomy of the groups. His Government believed that the ILO should take a consistent line on this issue.

In market-economy countries there were three types of ownership of the means of production that were more or less inter-related: public or state enterprises whose capital was entirely in the hands of the State, enterprises managed like private companies but with predominantly state-owned capital (more than 50 per cent), and private enterprises, which might involve some degree of public participation. The pattern varied from country to country according to national circumstances. The Governing Body was now being asked to subscribe to the principle that where there was a substantial proportion of private employers in a mainly public sector, they should be represented by at least four members in the joint committee for that sector. This was a problem of substance, and the Governing Body should be clear about the implications of the decision it was about to take. If it adopted the decision recommended in paragraph 39 certain structural problems might be
resolved, but this was a hybrid solution which, while maintaining the joint committees in their present form, affected the existing balance in their membership and opened up the likelihood that decisions might have to be taken by votes, in which the private employers might vote differently from the Government representatives. His Government was not opposed to such a decision, but simply wished to point out its implications. The alternative was to decide that joint committees for sectors in which there was a large contingent of private employers should no longer be considered as joint committees but as tripartite committees. All depended on what basic concept one had of the manner in which tripartism should operate.

Mr. Blondel (Worker, France) said that he had been perplexed by the remarks made by the Employers about the Ninth Session of the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers, as recorded in paragraph 44 of the report. He himself had gained the impression that the Workers' representatives had played an active part in the work of that session and enabled good progress to be made, and this was a fact to be welcomed. It was regrettable that the Office was being accused of being overambitious and trying to steal the limelight. It was his firm opinion that it was quite proper for the Office to be ambitious in its work, and this was in fact expected of it. As for the alleged excessive length of certain statements made during the session, there were times when the nature of the subject justified an intervention of some length. But the main point he wished to address related to the statement of the Employers' group that the Office had introduced progressive ideas in the Advisory Committee's conclusions. He was not sure whether the term "progressive" was intended to be complimentary or derogatory. Did it imply that the Employers' ideas might be reactionary? In any case, was it not the role of the Office to have ideas that would enable progress to be made? In his view, the Employers' reaction on this point was excessive, particularly since he had heard that at the end of the Advisory Committee's session an Employer participant had commented that the Workers had organised the session very well, and it was up to the Employers to do as well next time. These were the rules of the tripartite game, and it was quite unwarranted to criticise the behaviour of the Office in this connection.

Mr. García García (Government, Venezuela) associated himself with Mr. Albalate Lafita's remarks concerning the publication of reports in Spanish. In May 1985 there had been a general consensus in the Committee that the reports for any meeting to which a minimum of four Spanish-speaking countries - counting also Brazil - were invited should be published in Spanish. In 1986 there would be at least two meetings which complied with this requirement - namely, the Twelfth Session of the Coal Mines Committee and the Eleventh Session of the Building, Civil Engineering and Public Works Committee - but only one of them would have its reports published in Spanish. Spanish-speaking delegates, and in particular the Worker representatives, were placed at a great disadvantage by having to work on the basis of mere 20-page summaries of reports of more than 100 pages. His Government would therefore have preferred an immediate decision to be taken by the Governing Body that both the Committees he had mentioned should have their reports published in Spanish, instead of referring the matter to the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee in February 1986, but he was prepared to join any consensus that might be reached.

Mr. Siktanc (Government, Czechoslovakia) expressed his Government's reservations regarding the composition of joint committees, and in particular the points for decision in paragraphs 39 and 40. Mr. Albalate Lafita had already explained some of the problems involved and he agreed with those remarks. His Government had already expressed reservations on this question in different bodies in the past.
Paragraph 39 was also inappropriate for other reasons. Joint committees had been established to cover sectors - mainly service sectors - where there were no private enterprises, i.e. where the services were rendered by bodies set up and financed by the government. But a trend was taking place which was only partly reflected in paragraph 39. While it was true that private enterprises were to an increasing extent performing these activities in some countries, there were also other enterprises coming into being that were autonomous and managed their own affairs but did not form part of the private sector. Paragraph 39 was accordingly incomplete and did not reflect the real situation in many countries. It would therefore be preferable not to adopt this paragraph as it stood but to adjourn a decision so that the whole matter could be examined more carefully, taking into account all the views expressed on the subject.

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden) felt that there was some misunderstanding regarding paragraph 39, and referred by analogy to the Inland Transport Committee, which was tripartite in composition. Some of its sessions dealt with items concerning railways. In Sweden, which had been a member of that Committee for many years, two or three extremely small private railways operated but the vast bulk of the traffic was handled by the autonomous state railways. Sweden had therefore always nominated as Employers' delegate to those particular sessions a personnel officer or manpower director of that state enterprise, who sat in the Employers' group of the Committee. In the case of electricity, gas and water supplies, in so far as these were handled by the public sector, there was no problem for a joint committee to deal with them. However, there were countries including his own where half or more of that sector - and sometimes the entire sector - was in private hands. In such cases it would be inadequate to provide only for Government representation in that Committee. While the Committee could well remain bipartite because on a world-wide basis the State was dominant in that sector, steps should be taken to ensure that all components of the sector were adequately represented.

Mr. Vargas (Government, Nicaragua) referred to the question of the publication of reports in Spanish. His Government, acutely aware of the fact that because they did not receive documents in their own language Spanish-speaking delegates were placed at a serious disadvantage in meetings, fully supported the position taken by Mr. Albalate Lafita and Mr. Garcia Garcia.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany), following up on what Mr. Albalate Lafita and Mr. von Holten had said, pointed out that when the joint committees on postal and telecommunications services, teachers, public health, electricity, etc., examined working conditions or occupational safety they covered the whole sector; in most countries, this was a public sector, but in others a high proportion of the services concerned were provided by enterprises of the private sector. In this connection, paragraph 39 called for such private employers to be represented by a number of persons not exceeding four, and not by at least four persons as had been mistakenly stated.

As regards Mr. Blondel's comments on the Ninth Session of the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers, the Employers maintained the view that it was the Office's task to draft conclusions which reflected the discussions that had taken place and not to incorporate other ideas; in the case at issue the Office had construed its task in very broad terms.

Mr. Maier (Worker, Austria) pointed out that he had personally attended the Ninth Session of the Advisory Committee and could certify that the
conclusions drafted by the Office faithfully reflected the discussions that had taken place.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Bolin, Deputy Director-General) felt sympathy for the views expressed by the Government representatives of Spain, Venezuela and Nicaragua concerning the status of the Spanish language at Industrial Committee meetings. The Office would do its best to find the resources necessary to increase the number of committees for which the reports could be translated into Spanish.

As regards what had happened at the Ninth Session of the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers, it was unfortunate that the role of the Office had given rise to debate. The Office had to be somewhat ambitious in order to render service to all groups without distinction, but he felt certain that the secretariat of that Committee had never overstepped its role to the extent of introducing a quadripartite element into the meeting. He had full confidence in the staff concerned to display to the full the required objectivity and neutrality at all meetings, and if necessary would personally see to it that this requirement was observed on all occasions.

In putting the report to the Governing Body for adoption, the Chairman drew attention to the proposal made by Mr. Lindner that paragraph 36(1)(b) should be amended to make it clear that it referred to the sector concerned within each country.

Mr. Mehta (Worker, India) had misgivings about this proposal, since it might, if the word "country" were used, imply that only big countries with large working populations would be selected for membership of these committees.

Mr. von Holten (Employer, Sweden) explained that the purpose of the amendment was precisely to ensure that not only big countries were selected for committees since it enabled account to be taken of the relative importance of the sector within each country, instead of just selecting the countries on the basis of the size of their labour force or production in absolute figures. This corresponded, moreover, to the criteria laid down in the document Purposes and Functions of Industrial and Analogous Committees.

Mr. Mehta (Worker, India) said that, if the intention was to refer to the relative importance of the sector within each country, he would have no objection.

The Chairman proposed, in the interest of clarity, that paragraph 36(1)(b) be reworded as follows: "the relative importance in each country of the numbers of persons employed in the sector concerned, or of output in this sector".

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraph 36 of the report, as so amended.

The Chairman recalled that certain Government members had expressed reservations about paragraph 39. Comments had also been made about paragraph 97, but he assumed that the Governing Body was prepared to adopt it in view of the assurances provided by the Office.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 37, 38, 39, 40, 48, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75, 77, 97, 111 and 116, and took note of the remaining sections of the report.
Mr. Albalate Lafita (Government, Spain) pointed out that his Government had not expressed reservations on paragraphs 39 and 40, but had simply drawn attention to the implications of their adoption.

The sitting closed at 6.35 p.m.
NINTH SITTING
(Friday, 15 November 1985. Morning)

The sitting opened at 10.45 a.m., with Mr. Oechslin in the Chair.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE VOLCANO DISASTER IN COLOMBIA

The Chairman observed that the Governing Body would no doubt have learnt of the terrible disaster that had struck the town of Armero in Colombia the previous day. The entire town had been destroyed and the number of victims was extremely high. Despite his technical prowess, man was still powerless to prevent such natural disasters, of which there had been several in recent months. A tragedy of this kind gave rise to a natural feeling of human solidarity, and the Governing Body would no doubt wish the Director-General to send a message of sympathy to the Colombian Government and people. A member of the Governing Body, Mr. Escobar Padrón, came from Colombia, and to him in particular and to all the Colombian officials of the Office he expressed his profound sympathy on behalf of the Governing Body.

Mr. Escobar Padrón (Employer, Colombia) wished to thank all those who had expressed their condolences to him in connection with the disaster in a spirit of solidarity. It was a tragedy not only for his own country, but also for the Latin American region.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) concurred with the proposal to send a message of sympathy. However, such a message did little to alleviate suffering in real terms, and in this connection he recalled a proposal he had made at the Conference several years previously that an international fund should be set up to provide specifically for such disasters, which more often than not struck the very poor countries. It was unfortunate that in the present case no material assistance could be provided.

Mr. B.P. Kabore (Government, Burkina Faso) expressed his country's sympathy to the people of Colombia in connection with the disaster.

The Director-General reassured Mr. Muhr that his appeal had not been forgotten. Over the past few years measures had been taken under the aegis of the United Nations to attempt to meet the needs created by such disasters, although much more could obviously be done. There was in fact a United Nations fund for disaster operations, and the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator worked to mobilise, guide and co-ordinate aid to disaster-stricken countries and to promote preventive measures. The ILO was associated in its activities, to a modest extent, and had offered assistance in fields other than immediate relief. He would personally remain in contact with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the measures to be taken. He had in addition that morning personally expressed his sympathy to the Ambassador of Colombia in Geneva. The message of sympathy to the Colombian Government and people would be sent immediately following the closure of the present sitting.

It was so decided.
SEVENTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Discrimination

Mr. Heldal (Government, Norway), Chairman of the Committee, presented its report. Under the first item on its agenda, concerning ILO action on discrimination in employment and occupation, the Committee had paid particular attention to various aspects of the ratification and application of ILO Conventions against discrimination and to the role of employers' and workers' organisations in this connection. The Committee had stressed the importance of ILO activities to promote sexual equality, making particular reference to discussions at the 1985 Conference and the Nairobi Conference of July 1985. It had also paid tribute to the ILO's educational and promotional activities, which included seminars and the preparation of a draft guide of practice on equal opportunity and treatment in employment. The second item on the Committee's agenda had concerned the application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid in South Africa, and here the Committee had paid special attention to preparations for a tripartite evaluation mission to be fielded in 1986 as part of the ILO's programme against apartheid. This would give effect to a request made by the Governing Body in November 1984, based on recommendations made by the Lusaka Conference in May of that year, and the Committee had noted a preliminary Office report on the mission and had recommended the Governing Body to appoint its members. In conclusion, he wished to thank the two Vice-Chairmen of the Committee and the Office staff for their valuable contribution to the work of the Committee.

Miss Hak (Employer, Netherlands) drew attention to the fact that only in the Committee on Discrimination were the terms "chairperson" and "vice-chairperson" used. This was illogical, and she requested that its report should in future revert to the more usual terminology. Paragraph 12 of the report was in need of revision: it should state that the Committee took note of the report on the situation of workers in the occupied Arab territories - in its present form, it referred only to the Worker and Employer Vice-Chairmen. As regards the proposals in paragraph 13, the Employers' group had not had sufficient time to consider the proposals, and had asked the Committee to reconsider them at its next meeting. The Employers' group had also requested that the anti-apartheid programme should include assistance to small and medium-sized enterprises among its short-term objectives, as had been recommended in the conclusions of the Lusaka Conference. The Employers' group had been happy to learn that the Office intended to give effect to this request.

Mr. Dolan (Worker, Australia) paid tribute to the previous Worker Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, Mrs. Shirley Carr, who had now left the Governing Body. She had done much valuable work both for the Committee and for the Conference Committee on Apartheid.

The Workers' group had expressed concern at the extremely small number of new ratifications of ILO Conventions against discrimination, and had suggested that the Office make greater efforts to promote ratification: the Workers' group was ready to provide assistance in any form to help such work. The Workers' group was strongly opposed to any suggestion that the Conference Committee on Apartheid should meet only every other year, with a comparable meeting in a front-line State in the intervening years. The Conference Committee should continue to meet annually, but meetings such as those held in Livingstone and Lusaka were nevertheless necessary from time to time.
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Finally, the Workers' group was in favour of the tripartite evaluation mission scheduled for early 1986.

Mr. Derbi (Government, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) drew attention to paragraph 11 of the report, which had been drafted in such a way as to group together the problems of migrant workers in South Africa with the situation in his own country. The ILO mission that had recently visited the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had nothing to do with the Committee on Discrimination, and the reference to it in the report was inappropriate. As regards the situation of workers in the occupied Arab territories, the discrimination they suffered in relation to their wages, employment, social security and freedom of association would continue as long as the occupation continued. The ILO should send more missions to the occupied territories so as to remain in close contact with the situation there. The ILO could also do more to provide material and technical help to the workers concerned there.

The Director-General regretted that paragraph 11 of the Committee's report had been drafted in such a way as to suggest a comparison between two situations between which there was no link. It was a simple matter to correct the text, but this was for the Officers of the Committee to decide. The reference to the situation of migrant workers in southern Africa would perhaps be more appropriate in the section specifically dealing with apartheid. In so far as the Office was involved in the drafting of the report, he wished to express his regrets to Mr. Derbi.

Mr. Heldal (Government, Norway), speaking as Chairman and Reporter of the Committee, regretted the form of the last sentence in paragraph 11. It should naturally have been divided into two, the second half becoming a separate paragraph. With the agreement of the two Vice-Chairmen, he proposed an amendment to this effect.

Mr. Riikonen (Government, Finland) wished to place on record the measures taken by his own Government concerning apartheid since the last session of the Conference. In the United Nations, Finland had, in close co-operation with the other Nordic countries, worked actively towards the eradication of apartheid in South Africa. In 1978 the Nordic countries had adopted a joint programme of action against apartheid; last month that programme had been revised and extended by the Nordic Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and had been distributed as a United Nations document. Individually the Nordic countries had themselves adopted a number of unilateral measures which they intended to implement on a national level. Most of these related to economic issues, and included the discouragement of new investments and loan arrangements in or with South Africa and the full implementation of the measures advocated in Security Council Resolution No. 569. The Nordic Working Group would continue to consider further measures against South Africa, even though relations with that country had already been severely reduced. His own Government intended shortly to introduce new legislation to implement further measures concerning trade and economic relations.

Mr. Farag (representative of the Organisation of African Unity) noted the slow pace of ratification of Convention No. 111. He appealed to all governments that had not yet done so to ratify the Convention in order to lend it strength. As regards the ILO's activities in the field, the regional and subregional seminars on non-discriminatory employment practices were extremely important and useful, and more were needed: his own Organisation was prepared to assist in the preparation and organisation of such seminars. He wished to join the representative of the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in calling for further assistance to workers in the occupied Arab territories. As regards the second part of the report, he was pleased to note that the
questionnaire circulated this year to governments had included the point requested by the Conference Committee on Apartheid. The recent Conference of maritime trade unions on the implementation of the United Nations oil embargo against South Africa had, according to the report, adopted a Declaration, and it would have been useful for the Declaration to have been appended to the report or to the Office paper submitted to the Committee. Finally, he wished to thank all governments, non-governmental organisations and employers' and workers' organisations that had initiated programmes and projects to assist the liberation movement in South Africa.

Mr. M’Polo (Government, Angola) expressed support for the ILO's activities relating to discrimination in employment and occupation. Equal opportunity and equal treatment were key elements of social justice, and applied to wages, conditions of work and training. The ILO should continue its co-operation with other organisations to promote equal opportunity and treatment, which was a basic human right, so as to ensure that full account was taken of this requirement in development, investment and training programmes. The Office's work on migrant workers also deserved praise. Particular attention on this issue was necessary in view of the threat from South Africa to expel nationals of other Black South African countries: the sudden return of so many workers would create a great many problems for their home countries, which would not be able to find a solution without international assistance. The Office should therefore study ways of reducing the hardship suffered by workers as a result of the policy of the Pretoria Government. Some of the problems would involve retraining, job creation and vocational training.

He also wished to highlight the recent Tripartite Advisory Meeting on the integration of youth into working life in industrialised countries. This type of meeting was particularly valuable, and the Office should organise a similar one for the developing countries. As regards issues related to apartheid, he welcomed the Committee's decision to maintain the annual meeting of the Conference Committee and to retain the possibility of organising special meetings outside Geneva. The proposal to set up a small working group to examine replies to the Office questionnaire should be supported, for there was no duplication of effort involved, as some had claimed. Such a working group would have more time than the Committee on Discrimination or the Conference Committee to examine the replies in depth. He welcomed the action taken by the Director-General in response to the recent unrest in South Africa. Finally, he regretted the statement in paragraph 27 by the United States Government representative concerning national liberation movements. This was in his view a slight upon the Black people of South Africa and Namibia.

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon) found the wording of paragraph 12 somewhat illogical. It made no sense to refer only to the Worker and Employer Vice-Chairpersons in a case where it was for the whole Committee to take note of a particular report. This error should be corrected.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) thought that some clarification was necessary. The Governing Body was surely not authorised to amend a report of a Committee, which constituted a record of its proceedings verified by its Reporter. On the other hand, should the Officers of the Committee decide that an amendment was necessary, this would naturally be acceptable. As regards the issue raised by Mr. Derbi, the recent expulsions of foreign workers from his country were not unique. Such incidents occurred in many countries throughout the world, and as Mr. M’Polo had pointed out, created special difficulties in certain countries. If the ILO was to play its full role in relation to migrant workers, an issue that was well within its field
of competence, it would have to pay close attention to the dramatic events occurring in that field in the present day. The most dramatic were naturally the mass expulsions, which could occur in any country. The workers at risk in such situations were among the most underprivileged members of society, and they suffered serious disruptions of their lives. Consideration should therefore be given to holding a seminar or a similar meeting to discuss this major problem.

The Chairman agreed with Mr. Falchi's point regarding the procedure for the consideration of reports of Governing Body committees. In effect there were two methods whereby such reports were adopted. The first method was followed by the Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee, which met to adopt its report, thus leaving no scope for subsequent amendment; the second applied to all the other committees, whose reports were approved by their Officers on their behalf. In such cases it was legitimate for a speaker to refer to inaccuracies in the reporting of his comments in the committee in question. Mr. Heldal's proposal seemed to meet the request made by Mr. Derbi, whom he wished to thank for his constructive approach to the problem.

Mr. Derbi (Government, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) explained that his reservations referred as much to content as to style. His main concern was that the recent problems concerning migrant workers in his own country did not fall within the competence of the Committee on Discrimination, and were not in fact covered by any item on its agenda. References to the situation in his country were therefore inappropriate in the Committee's report, and should be deleted. The termination of workers' contracts of employment did not in itself constitute discrimination. His Government believed as a principle that freedom should be protected, including freedom of association, for it was a basic freedom. In addition other principles, including the protection of the oppressed throughout the world, had to be observed.

After further consultations between the Officers of the Committee, Mr. Derbi and a representative of the Director-General, Mr. Heldal announced that it had been agreed that paragraph 11 should end at the word "South Africa" in the eighth line, the rest of that sentence being deleted.

Mr. B.P. Kabore (Government, Burkina Faso) welcomed the work of the Organisation to combat discrimination in South Africa and to assist workers in the occupied Arab territories. He thanked all international agencies and countries that had taken concrete and effective measures against apartheid. The Office should continue to strengthen its activities against apartheid, which was a disgrace to all humanity.

Mr. Davere de (Government, Argentina) expressed support for the work of the Committee on Discrimination. As regards action against apartheid, his Government had recently ratified the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, and had ordered the withdrawal of the diplomatic representative of South Africa in Argentina. His Government had issued press bulletins regarding the introduction of a state of siege in South Africa and condemning the wave of repressive violence to which it had given rise. It had also requested the South African Government to liberate Nelson Mandela. As regards other forms of discrimination, his Government had also ratified the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) supported the views expressed by Mr. Derbi regarding paragraph 11 of the report, and those of Mr. M'Polo regarding paragraph 27. Furthermore, he considered the level of ILO
activities concerning the training of young people to be unsatisfactory. As regards action on apartheid, full support should be given to the application of the strongest possible sanctions against the South African Government. Finally, he wished to amend paragraph 20 of the report, which summarised the comments made by the representative of his Government in the Committee: in the fourth line from the end, the words "the State and the citizens" should be replaced by "public organisations".

Mr. Jackson (Government, United States) emphasised that his Government's views on national liberation movements were set out quite clearly in paragraph 27 of the report. They could in no way be regarded as constituting any condemnation of the struggle of the Black people against apartheid in their search for freedom and equality. His Government's position on the injustice of apartheid was also explicitly set forth in paragraph 22. There were better ways of financing Black trade union movements than through the channels of national liberation movements, which by their nature were unable to take account of the interests of all those affected by apartheid.

Mr. El-Telawi (representative of the Arab Labour Organisation) agreed with Miss Hak and Mr. Nasr that the wording of paragraph 12 was somewhat illogical. Nevertheless, it was not enough for the Committee merely to take note of reports on the situation of workers in the occupied Arab territories, for greater efforts were necessary to resolve the problems of such workers, who suffered discrimination. More concrete solutions should be sought, and this should be borne in mind in preparations for the mission that was to visit the occupied Arab territories.

Mr. Cherief (Government, Algeria) said that his Government paid great attention to the work of the Committee on Discrimination, and hoped that the Organisation would increase its efforts to combat apartheid, which was a scourge to the human race. The people of South Africa were passing through a crucial period in their history, and he therefore supported the idea of holding further tripartite meetings in front-line States. He wished to draw the attention of the Organisation to its responsibilities towards workers in the occupied Arab territories, who suffered inhuman and degrading treatment. The ILO mission to visit those territories should deal with all issues concerning the discrimination suffered by workers in their lives and in their work.

Mr. Tikriti (Government, Iraq) also felt that more could be done to assist workers in the occupied Arab territories. The reports of previous missions to those territories clearly demonstrated the sufferings of the workers there, who were subjected to discrimination; this situation merited greater attention. What workers suffered in the occupied territories was no less than the hardships suffered by Blacks in South Africa. He wished to express his sympathy for and solidarity with the workers of South Africa and the occupied territories, as well as all workers anywhere who suffered discrimination on whatever account.

Mrs. Hernandez Oliva (Government, Cuba) expressed satisfaction at the measures adopted by the ILO concerning apartheid and in general concerning workers who were victims of discrimination in South Africa and elsewhere. However, it was regrettable that some governments still failed to take the necessary measures to help make the action taken against apartheid more effective. This applied in particular to multinational enterprises, whose policies ran counter to those of the United Nations. Her Government attached particular importance to the resolution adopted by the recent Conference of maritime trade unions on the implementation of a United Nations oil embargo against South Africa. She also supported the statement by the representative of the Government of Angola, as well as the principle of holding meetings in
front-line States. In addition, she expressed support for the statement made by Mr. Derbi concerning workers in the occupied Arab territories.

Subject to the deletion of the words following "South Africa" in the last sentence of paragraph 11 of the report, the Governing Body took note of the report and approved the recommendations in paragraph 31 thereof.

The Chairman then requested nominations for the tripartite evaluation mission due to take place early in 1986.

On the proposal of Mr. Kebede (Government, Ethiopia; Government Vice-Chairman), the Governing Body approved the following nominations:

**Government group:** Mr. Heldal (Norway)
Mr. Kebede (Ethiopia)

**Employers' group:** Mr. Sumbwe
Substitute: Mr. Dooge

**Workers' group:** Mr. Mohamed.

**SIXTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA**

Report of the Committee on Operational Programmes

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon), who had acted as Chairman of the Committee, introduced its report. Assessing ILO operational activities in 1984, the Committee had noted the continuing reduction in UNDP resources, accompanied by an increase in bilateral funding arrangements and a slight increase in the regular budget allocation. The Committee had considered it necessary to emphasise training activities and had taken note of the co-operation between the ILO and other specialised agencies. Little progress seemed to have been made, however, regarding the participation of employers and workers in operational activities, which should be encouraged. The Committee had held a preliminary discussion of the item on ILO operational activities concerning women, which would continue at its next meeting once consultations had been undertaken concerning the assessment of selected projects. Discussing operational activities questions in the United Nations system, the Committee had emphasised the importance of co-operation between the agencies and had stressed the role of the ILO as a tripartite organisation. Consideration had also been given to ways of promoting the ILO's operational activities within the framework of the United Nations system.

In this connection, the Employers' group wished to express satisfaction at the constructive relations established between the ILO's Regional Office for Africa in Addis Ababa and the OAU secretariat, and hoped that this would result in enhancing the effectiveness of the ILO's work in Africa.

As regards the situation in Africa, the Committee had given considerable attention to an Office paper outlining the ILO's activities to date in helping

---

1 See also tenth sitting.
to alleviate the crisis created by drought and famine. A statement had been made by the representative of the Government of Ethiopia on behalf of the African members of the Committee, which was summarised in paragraph 60, and the Employers' and Workers' groups supported this statement. All members of the Committee had expressed their solidarity with Africa in its efforts to overcome the crisis. Finally, the Committee had taken note of the new Statute of the Asian and Pacific Skill Development Programme (APSDEP).

Mr. Kebede (Government, Ethiopia; Government Vice-Chairman) thanked Mr. Nasr for having acted as Chairman of the Committee in his absence. He drew attention to the Committee's current examination of ILO operational activities concerning women, which would continue at its next meeting. In Africa the overwhelming majority of the population lived in rural areas, and some 70 per cent of rural inhabitants were in fact women. They performed most of the work, and it was therefore essential to give considerable attention to ways of improving the living standards of women and to integrate them in all development processes. He looked forward to the continuance of the Committee's work in the coming year. The resource situation, however, was a cause for concern. The reduction in resources for activities in Africa was particularly regrettable in 1984, when the continent had been stricken by an unprecedented drought and famine and there was an urgent need to create jobs and provide support for vulnerable groups. He appealed to the donor community to remain aware of this need and to be more responsive to the requirements of African countries for ILO technical co-operation. On the other hand, the resolution and the Programme of Action for Africa adopted by the Conference in June 1985 had been greatly welcomed. The Programme of Action had resulted in a great deal of preparatory work and the pooling of expertise from headquarters and the field. He requested the Director-General to involve the Office units responsible for activities concerning employers and workers in the work of the interdepartmental task force, and to include a review of the Office's activities in relation to the critical economic situation in Africa in the Governing Body's work at its 233rd Session in May 1986, prior to the Conference. The Office should also explore a number of possibilities for financing ILO activities in Africa in accordance with the decision taken by the Governing Body at its 229th Session and the Conference resolution. Finally, he wished to thank the Office for the work it had already done to assist emergency operations in the affected areas, particularly that regarding transport and logistic support.

Mr. Georget (Employer, Niger) welcomed the reorganisation of the Office units dealing with technical co-operation into a single department. The Employers' group attached particular importance to the integration of women in development processes. The ILO should recruit more women experts from the developing regions, and this issue would receive further discussion at the Committee's next meeting. As regards operational activities questions in the United Nations system, the Employers wished to emphasise the ILO's importance as the only tripartite agency. The Committee had noted with concern the decrease in resources for technical co-operation, and in this connection he wished to stress the importance of purchasing equipment locally or within the region, so as to facilitate maintenance arrangements; the need for special attention to the least developed countries; the importance of technical co-operation between developing countries; the need to diversify the recruitment of experts from developing countries so as to promote TCDC; the need to strengthen the activities of the regional centres and programmes; and finally, the importance of co-operation between the Turin Centre and those regional centres. Tripartite participation, it should not be forgotten, was also an asset in development, and here the Employers wished to acknowledge the assistance provided to employers' organisations. The Office should also implement the assistance project for South African refugees living in...
front-line States, aimed at helping them develop small- and medium-scale undertakings and to strengthen the informal sector. Finally, the Conference resolution should be implemented as quickly as possible so as to enhance assistance to Africa, particularly in the countries stricken by drought. Drought was not the only problem: governments should also place emphasis on food crops. He trusted that ILO experts visiting the region would contact employers' and workers' organisations.

The sitting closed at 1 p.m.
The sitting opened at 3.05 p.m., with Mr. Oechslin in the Chair.

SIXTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Operational Programmes (concl.)¹

Mr. Youcef Briki (Worker, Algeria) expressed serious concern at the continuing reduction in resources: expenditure had now reached an alarmingly low level, and the ILO's capacity to implement its most important programmes adequately was seriously compromised. The reduction was particularly noticeable in the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean. The distribution of resources by programme was also a cause for concern: activities in the field of employment and training had suffered considerable reductions, whereas they were indisputably the two most important areas of work for the Organisation. While the Office's efforts to cope with the resource situation merited praise, it was obvious that additional measures were needed immediately in order to safeguard the essential components of activities in these fields.

The Workers' group was satisfied with the effect given to two resolutions adopted by the Conference over the past two years - the resolution concerning the most urgent problems of Africa, and particularly food security, in the framework of development, and the resolution concerning assistance to the least developed countries. However, as regards the LDCs, they clearly deserved more than 30 per cent of overall technical co-operation expenditure. He noted with satisfaction the Office's policy of employing more national experts and observed that there had been a slight increase in fellowships, measured in participant-days. The Workers' group had always stressed the importance of fellowships for those who were unable to pay the cost of participating in such activities. Expenditure in Africa had also fallen, by 8.4 per cent, although its share in overall expenditure had increased: it was particularly regrettable that this continent should have suffered a reduction in resources in 1984, when it had also been stricken by drought and famine. In view of population growth and the employment and development problems Africa faced, programmes and projects were needed on population questions, and it was hoped that the shortfall in resources from UNDP would not affect the impact of such activities.

As regards Asia and the Pacific, he fully supported the orientation of the technical co-operation programme in the region, most of the resources having been directed towards training and employment activities. As for individual programmes, he welcomed the successful continuation of the special public works programmes, which were of great value to developing countries in view of their manpower-intensive nature. He was also pleased to note that it had been possible to avoid any major reduction in the workers' education programme thanks to contributions from multilateral donors. The enhancement of the services provided by regional advisers also merited praise.

¹ See also ninth sitting.
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for they provided a valuable assistance to workers and their organisations and were important for the promotion of the ILO’s principles and objectives in the regions. The Workers' group also supported the priorities and criteria applied in workers' education activities, as well as the Office's efforts to strengthen tripartite participation; problems with regard to the latter were largely of a practical nature, and did not concern policy issues. The Workers' group continued to regard co-operatives as important vehicles for the improvement of standards of living and the promotion of self-sufficiency among underprivileged groups, and they supported the ILO's programmes in this field. One particular need perceived by the Workers' group, however, was the need to train workers' representatives to enable them to contribute fully to the work of national tripartite bodies. Courses on this theme had been organised by the Office in 1984, and it was hoped that they would be strengthened.

As regards activities to promote women, the Workers' group approved the priorities followed by the Office, and drew attention to the importance of projects for women in rural areas and in handicrafts. All ILO projects should benefit both men and women, and it was hoped that the number of women benefiting from general projects would increase. The Workers' group hoped in particular that no reduction would be made in the resources allocated to activities for women. Finally, the Workers' group fully supported the statement made on behalf of the African group by the representative of the Government of Ethiopia, and was convinced that the Office would do all it could to implement the Programme of Action adopted by the 1985 Conference. They supported in particular the call for a report on the implementation of the programme to be submitted to the Governing Body at its 233rd Session.

Mr. Papuli (representative of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation) thought that Mr. Georget's statement in paragraph 49 of the report indicated a misunderstanding of UNIDO's role in industrial training. It was not true that all industrial training fell within the ILO's terms of reference, for UNIDO had a mandate to promote the development of human resources as part of its technical assistance programme. Some degree of overlapping was inevitable in the work of the two organisations, but the secretariats of the ILO and UNIDO were taking steps to improve the co-ordination of their programmes and projects in order to keep such overlapping at a minimum. UNIDO would welcome greater participation of employers' and workers' organisations in its activities, particularly through its system of consultation, which stipulated that participants from each member State should include not only government officials, but also representatives of industry, labour, consumer groups and others deemed appropriate by the government concerned. However, the Organisation's ability to accommodate certain requests made by the policy-making bodies of sister agencies was limited by the mandate it received from its Board and its General Conference. Nevertheless, the efforts of other agencies to strengthen co-ordination and co-operation were welcomed. It was hoped that these facts would be borne in mind by the Governing Body of the ILO.

Mr. Ventejol (Government, France) wished to comment only on the item concerning the situation in Africa. The resolution adopted by the Conference in 1985 constituted a valuable undertaking on the part of the Organisation, and he was pleased to note that action had already been taken to give effect to its provisions as part of the Action Programme for Africa. His Government placed great emphasis on concrete action and would do all it could to promote the joint effort. The unanimous adoption of the Conference resolution was sure to guarantee co-operation, which should be regarded as the freedom of each State to take decisions regarding avenues for research and practical measures. Financing was an important aspect of the operations, particularly for research, and, in his capacity as Chairman of the Economic and Social
Council of France, he had personally ordered practical research to assess the resources available within France that could be given to the international effort undertaken by the ILO. The Programme of Action was a valuable basis for co-operation, to which his own Government would lend full support.

Mr. Bhatnagar (Government, India) stated that his country, like many others, experienced its most essential labour problems in the areas of employment, youth, the development of human resources, occupational safety and health and the working environment. This view had been shared by the Conference of Ministers of Labour of the Asian and Pacific Region, held recently in Melbourne. That Conference had emphasised the need for greater technical co-operation and for the requisite support from the ILO. It had also identified the provision of employment for youth in both rural and urban areas as deserving greatest attention; it had considered that solutions should be sought that were suited to the rural and semi-urban populations of developing countries in the region. Many of the views expressed by the Conference were reflected in the Committee's report. One particular cause for concern was the high cost of international experts: it was essential to adapt programmes to the stage of development of each country, and this meant taking account of the local expertise available there. Greater efforts should be made by the regions themselves to secure co-operation in the provision of experts. It was hoped that the decisions of the Melbourne Conference would be taken into account in the implementation of the ILO's technical co-operation programme. The forthcoming Tenth Asian Regional Conference in Jakarta would also provide an opportunity for an exchange of views on such issues.

Turning to the Committee's report, he shared the Committee's concern at the reduction in resources, and particularly in the Asian Region. This reduction had in particular affected ILO activities in the fields of employment and development, vocational training and sectoral activities, which were of key interest to developing countries. He also shared the view expressed by the Workers' group that the provision of aid should not be made conditional on policy reform within recipient countries. The reorganisation of the Office units responsible for technical co-operation was appropriate and would strengthen activities. As regards the situation of women, his own Government had endeavoured to remove sexual discrimination, and its employment generation policy sought to ensure that women enjoyed equal opportunities. Women often bore the brunt of technological progress, and his Government sought also to prevent this. The Programme of Action for Africa deserved full support, and he endorsed the general approach adopted by the ILO to the situation in Africa. His own country had twice experienced the food problems now faced in Africa in recent times, and fully understood the degree of human suffering involved.

Mr. Farag (representative of the Organisation for African Unity) welcomed the ILO's action to implement the resolution adopted by the 1985 Conference, and particularly the close and effective working relations between the ILO Regional Office for Africa in Addis Ababa and the secretariat of the OAU. The priorities set out in the Programme of Action would no doubt facilitate the ILO's work to help alleviate the present situation, and it would no doubt wish to take account of the priorities identified at the most recent summit meeting of the OAU when implementing the Programme. In particular, the ILO had an important contribution to make in the harnessing of water resources, for example, the digging of wells and storage of water. While efforts concerning railways and port operations merited praise, more could be done in these areas, and the ILO could also involve itself in more special public works programmes and projects concerning rural development and vocational training in order to increase employment opportunities. It should be noted that the African delegations to the current session of the United Nations General
Assembly had tabled a resolution calling for a special session of the General Assembly to examine the critical economic situation in Africa in April 1986.

Mr. Daverende (Government, Argentina) expressed his gratitude to the ILO for all the valuable work it had performed under its technical co-operation programme. Nevertheless, the continuing reduction in resources was a serious cause for concern, and the Latin American and Caribbean Region had again suffered the most serious reduction. He had in particular noted in the Committee's report and the Office paper submitted to the Committee the section dealing with technical co-operation between developing countries, which was of importance to development: local experts were of great value, and many were available in his own region where co-operation offered a useful model for other regions. He wished to pay tribute in particular to the work of CINTERFOR and the activities of the Turin Centre. Finally, it was essential to realise that international assistance to Africa must continue until a lasting solution had been found to the economic and social crisis it now faced.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) stated that, while it was recognised that technical co-operation was a vital element of the Organisation's activities and that the implementation of technical co-operation programmes was efficient, nevertheless resources continued to fall, and greater emphasis was being placed on bilateral co-operation. A number of essential sectors of national economies were deprived of valuable ILO assistance simply by the lack of resources. This should prompt reflection on the division of responsibility to rectify the situation: the donor countries themselves held responsibility on two counts: they should give greater consideration to the possibilities for multi-bilateral co-operation, which had been found to work well in many cases and lent greater impact to other assistance provided; they could also take steps to encourage international financing agencies to provide greater resources, for example, by bringing greater pressure to bear on the UNDP and other financing agencies to accord assistance to ILO programmes. While there were statements of positive policy to this effect in the Governing Body, these never seemed to find an echo in the subsequent action taken by governments making them. Encouragement in this direction could perhaps be provided by the inclusion of a table in the annual report to the Committee on activities in the previous year, showing the amount of aid contributed by different governments. For their part, the recipient countries could show greater consistency in their attitude to ILO assistance, and this included in particular the allocation of adequate priority to ILO assistance. Ministers of labour and national agencies concerned with labour issues should press harder for resources. The ILO itself could make greater efforts in the training of experts: while it was widely acknowledged that the quality of ILO experts was high, the experts did not always show a full understanding of the aims, structure or basic role of the Organisation. Local experts required greater preparation from the regional offices before they were assigned to projects. In this connection he drew attention to an apparent error in paragraph 33 of the report: the first sentence suggested that some bias against external experts was legitimate, whereas this was surely not the case. In addition, a clear understanding was necessary of the considerations to be made in determining project inputs, and particularly the choice of local or international experts. Recruitment of the former entailed their removal from activities within their own countries, while international experts provided a valuable exchange of experience. Undue haste to recruit local experts could create serious problems for the technical co-operation programme.

Mr. Albalate Lafita (Government, Spain) agreed with previous speakers that international co-operation was essential in technical assistance. This applied in particular to the functioning of the Turin Centre. The ILO was unique in its capacity to offer effective technical co-operation to developing countries in all parts of the world, and full advantage should be taken of
this. It was therefore essential to improve the organisation and co-ordination of technical co-operation. The situation in Africa called for an immediate solution, and he had noted with interest the statement by the representative of the OAU. It was essential for the developed countries to develop a greater sense of solidarity with the rest of the world, and to realise that they had many problems in common. Only in this way would it be possible to ensure the prosperity of all.

Mr. Wang (Government, China) welcomed the creation of the new Department of Technical Co-operation, which would bring improvements in the co-ordination of technical co-operation activities. He wished the new department every success. As a priority it was necessary to strengthen assistance to Africa, and full support should therefore be given to the Programme of Action. Technical co-operation resources should be increased, particularly for activities relating to agriculture, a key sector of the African economy.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) thanked the speakers for their comments, which were noted with great interest. The Office fully shared the concern voiced by all speakers at the continuing reduction in resources available for the ILO's technical co-operation programme. It should, however, be borne in mind that the ILO not only provided direct assistance, but also facilitated the flow of resources to developing countries from other agencies on projects of interest to the ILO, in particular from the World Bank, regional development banks and food-aid agencies, which now allocated a greater proportion of their resources to fields such as employment and training. The Office also shared the concern at the proportional decrease in activities in such priority fields as employment, training and rural development, but it should be realised that much of the responsibility for according significant priority to such fields rested with beneficiary countries themselves. Ministries in charge of activities in these fields should prevail upon national co-ordinating and planning authorities to accord higher priority to such areas. Figures available for the first nine months of 1985 tended to indicate that the decline in resources had been arrested, and were in fact slightly higher than in the corresponding period of 1984. As regards the situation in Africa, the Office would submit a progress report on its work to the Governing Body at its 233rd Session in May-June 1986. Finally, in reply to the representative of UNIDO, he stated that relations between the ILO and UNIDO secretariats were good; the Joint Standing Committee operated effectively, and problems of co-ordination in the field of training had now been overcome. He looked forward to continuing co-operation with UNIDO in all areas of concern to the two organisations.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

EIGHTEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Committee on Multinational Enterprises

Mr. Dolan (Worker, Australia), who had acted as Chairman of the Committee, presented its report. The Committee had been informed of reactions to the interpretation of the Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, endorsed by the Governing Body in February 1985. It had also received information on preparatory work for the next evaluation of the effect given to the Declaration in member States, to be considered by the Committee in November
1986. The Committee had commented favourably on the Office's intensified activities to promote awareness and application of the Declaration, and particular mention had been made of the assistance provided by regional advisers on labour standards and the Office units responsible for relations with employers' and workers' organisations. Such reports would in future be received by the Committee on an annual basis. Full application of the Declaration had been requested by recent sessions of the Conference and in resolutions of Industrial Committees. Further promotional efforts were therefore expected of the Office, governments and employers' and workers' organisations, as well as multinationals themselves.

The Committee had also expressed appreciation of studies and current research on multinationals carried out by the Office. These included recent publications on multinationals' information and consultation procedures and their decision-making structures. The authority and accuracy of the studies derived largely from their tripartite sources. The Office continued its co-operation with the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations in such research. The Committee had noted with interest developments concerning the UN Code of Conduct and activities in other United Nations agencies, as well as in the OECD and the EEC. Some concern was expressed at the possibilities of duplication within the UN system, and the Committee was requested to explore this question further. As regards the item concerning criteria for determining the receivability of requests for interpretation of the declaration, further consultations were necessary within the Employers' group, and the item had therefore been deferred to the Committee's next meeting. In paragraph 35 of the report the Committee had made a number of recommendations to guide its work.

As this was the last session of the Governing Body he would attend as a member, he wished to say farewell to the other members of the Governing Body. The five years he had spent with the Governing Body had been a valuable experience and one of the most productive periods of his 37 years as a trade union official. The ILO had tremendous capacity to improve the well-being of mankind, and despite the difficulties it faced from time to time he was sure it would continue to perform the task assigned to it so many years ago. He wished the ILO every success in its work.

Mr. Flunder (Employer, United Kingdom) stated that the Employers' group supported the recommendations in paragraph 35. The Office studies were of an extremely high quality, in particular that concerning decision-making procedures in multinationals, an extremely complex subject. The series of monographs on different aspects of multinationals were a major contribution to studies of this kind, and were unique. As regards possibilities of duplication within the UN system, the information on mutual arrangements concerning attendance at meetings of the other agencies suggested that it was necessary for their respective secretariats to meet in order to discuss ways of avoiding such duplication.

Mr. Peterson (Government, United States) agreed with the previous speaker's assessment of the two Office studies. He noted with interest that the Governing Body would in 1986 have before it the reports from governments on the effect given to the Tripartite Declaration over the past three years. That review would provide an excellent factual basis for future discussions in the ILO on multinational enterprises. The previous two such reviews, based on the questionnaire, had done much to help the Governing Body avoid the highly speculative and unsubstantiated opinions which at times took the place of hard facts. The tripartite co-operation that had underlain the reviews had enhanced the objectivity and credibility of the Committee's work, and it was hoped that such co-operation would continue in the future. He also wished to commend the Office for its efforts to promote the principles
embodied in the Declaration, and he looked forward to the findings of the 1986 review, which should reflect the fruit of such work. He supported the point for decision in paragraph 36 of the report.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) considered that interpretations of the Declaration should only be provided in cases where all other possibilities of resolving disputes at the national level had been exhausted. In addition, if an interpretation was requested on a general issue, it should not be considered as binding in respect of any specific labour dispute. Moreover, it would be improper for the ILO to interpret national legislation. The ILO should instead lend consideration to the negative impact on the situation of workers of the activities of transnational corporations, and the Conference should adopt a Convention on the protection of workers and their trade unions in transnational corporations.

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

TRIBUTE TO MR. CLIFF DOLAN

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) was sorry to see Mr. Dolan leave the Governing Body after five years of valuable service as a member of the Workers' group. The Workers would lose a strong campaigner whose competence and personal qualities had gained him many friends.

Mr. Flunder (Employer, United Kingdom) stated that Mr. Dolan had indeed been a staunch friend and a sturdy foe, and he had greatly esteemed him as a partner in the Committee on Multinational Enterprises. He regretted his retirement from the Governing Body, and wished him every happiness for the future.

The Chairman was surprised to learn of the retirement of one so young. Those who knew Mr. Dolan were sure that he would not remain idle in his retirement, and was certain to remain loyal to the Organisation. The Governing Body had known in Mr. Dolan a warm and friendly colleague whose contribution over the years, and particularly in the Committee on Multinational Enterprises, had been greatly appreciated. His work with the ILO reflected a long-standing association between the Australian labour movement and the ILO. On behalf of the Governing Body he wished him many long and fruitful years of retirement.

The Director-General thanked Mr. Dolan for the patience, tolerance and friendliness with which he had treated his colleagues in the Governing Body and in the Office. He had performed the tasks assigned to him with great care and dedication. Mr. Dolan was sure to remain active and energetic in his retirement, and he wished him every happiness and success in his new life.

COMPOSITION OF THE GOVERNING BODY

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) announced that, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 5, of the Governing Body's Standing Orders, the Workers' group had appointed Mr. Simon Crean to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Mr. Cliff Dolan. Mr. Crean would replace Mr. Dolan on the Governing Body committees of which the latter
was a member or substitute member. Mr. Crean had also replaced Mr. Dolan as President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions.

NINETEENTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

International Institute for Labour Studies
Report on the Twenty-Seventh Session of the Board of the Institute

Mr. Nasr (Employer, Lebanon) welcomed the appointment of Mr. Kane as Director of the Institute, and expressed appreciation of his efforts to reorient its activities. He had made proposals concerning the selection of subjects for study and for the Institute's working methods. According to these proposals, work would focus on three main areas, which were summarised in paragraph 20 of the report. However, some time was necessary for serious reflection on the proposals for the future trends of the Institute's programme, and it was too early to take any final decision on the matter. Consideration should be given to whether those three areas deserved special emphasis in the studies and publications of the Institute; the degree of attention to be given to each of them; and the teaching activities envisaged. The number of seminars and the duration of the internship courses offered also deserved further thought. The Governing Body should therefore defer examination of the new proposals to the next session of the Governing Body.

Mr. Adiko (Worker, Ivory Coast), speaking on behalf of the Workers' group in the absence of Mr. David, acknowledged that 1985 had been a year of transition. It was therefore reassuring to note that the Institute had fared reasonably well during the year with its usual tasks. As regards the proposals for future trends in its programme, the Director seemed to have taken due account of the limited means available to the Institute, and had suggested that work should focus on three main areas - new industrial organisation, workers' participation and labour markets. The Institute should be able to rely to the greatest extent possible on the facilities available in the ILO. The Workers' group fully supported the proposals concerning educational activities and congratulated the Director on an extremely clear report. The Workers' group also considered that tripartite meetings should be organised not only in Geneva, but also - and mainly - in the regions, which would bring savings. In conclusion, however, he agreed with Mr. Nasr that more time was necessary to reflect on the proposals and that no final decision should be taken for the moment.

Mr. M'Polo (Government, Angola) congratulated the Director on his proposals for the future programme of the Institute, which reflected a considerable degree of consultation with those concerned, and in particular the beneficiaries, such as national institutions, workers and employers. He drew attention in particular to a seminar on social policy organised by the Institute in Brasilia for seven Portuguese-speaking countries, which he had himself attended. The seminar had been an undoubted success. It had achieved its aims and had been a valuable occasion for an exchange of ideas and experience. However, similar courses would in future benefit from greater attention to matters of detail: participants needed a clearer idea of their role in the seminar, and it might be useful for them to receive advice from the regional advisers on any information they might be expected to provide. Greater secretariat services were also needed to produce summaries of the proceedings of the seminars and a final report. Particular thanks were due to the National Confederation of Commercial Workers of Brazil who had
provided premises for the seminar, and to the Brazilian Government for hosting it. As regards proposals for the future, some thought should be given to financial resources and relations with national research centres. Finally, the Brazilian Government and the National Confederation of Brazilian Industry had offered to publish and distribute a number of the Institute's publications in Portuguese, which would be extremely valuable.

Mr. Siktanc (Government, Czechoslovakia) expressed satisfaction at the information supplied on the Institute's activities, and welcomed the orientation towards research on subjects of world interest that were of interest to developed and developing countries alike. Extensive co-operation with national research institutes seemed advisable as a means of enriching co-operation between member States and making rational use of limited financial resources. He also supported the Director's proposals for future trends in the Institute's programme. He trusted that universality would underpin its activities and that research would remain aware of the inter-relation between the subjects studied. The unifying theme for the Institute's work - the role of labour institutions in economic and social progress and how such institutions adapted to changes and encouraged or restricted them - was appropriate; the three main areas for research reflected the principle of universality, although the subject of labour markets would be better termed "systems and policies for the utilisation of human resources", as the former term applied only to market economy countries. The socialist countries had valuable experience in this field that would be useful to other countries. The themes of social protection and income distribution did not receive sufficient attention in the ILO, and some consideration should be given to this in the Institute's research.

Mr. Falchi (Government, Italy) voiced his appreciation of the Director's efforts to reorganise the Institute's activities. His proposals for the future programme of its work were appropriate. However, time was necessary to reflect on the proposals, and at the next session of the Governing Body it would be useful to hold an in-depth discussion of all aspects of the situation. This could perhaps be done in a working group. In the meantime, the Director could be authorised to continue to develop his proposals.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) considered that the proposals for the Institute's future programme were essentially oriented to the technical aspects of the issues concerned, and tended to overlook their social aspects. The Institute should turn its attention to such questions as the struggle against unemployment, the social and economic aspects of disarmament, and the negative effects on workers of the activities of transnational corporations. As suggested, the Institute should also develop its contacts with national research institutes.

Mr. Georget (Employer, Niger) stated that the Employers attached particular importance to the Institute, and particularly to its educational activities, which were useful to both employers and workers. The proposals for the future orientation of its programme were highly interesting, but merited further consideration before a final decision was taken. Their contents showed the degree of consultation that had taken place, and were well co-ordinated. However, Mr. David's comments regarding the resources available to the Institute in paragraph 24 of the report should be borne in mind.

Mr. Ducray (Government, France) welcomed the proposal to postpone final consideration of the orientation of the Institute's programme to the next session of the Governing Body. At this stage he would confine his comments to the functioning of the Institute. The new Director deserved credit for his efforts to improve the role of the Institute and for his work in preparing the
proposals. Further information on those proposals would be welcome at the Governing Body's next session so that it could determine how to make the best possible use of the facilities offered by the Institute. International co-operation was essential to make the Institute a useful instrument for research.

Mr. Farag (representative of the Organisation of African Unity) congratulated the Director of the Institute on the excellent report he had prepared, and requested that the future programme of tripartite seminars include a symposium on the socio-economic aspects of the Lagos Plan of Action, with special reference to the prevailing critical economic situation in Africa.

The Chairman took it that the Governing Body wished to postpone final consideration of the Director's proposals for the future trends of the Institute's programme to its next session, and that an item concerning the Institute should be placed on the agenda in a position of some priority in order to allow for an adequate exchange of views.

It was so decided.

The Governing Body took note of the report.

TWENTIETH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Composition and agenda of standing bodies and meetings

First paper

The Governing Body took note of the information in paragraphs 1-12 of the Office paper.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman), referring to the request from the Asian and Oceanic Trade Union Co-ordination Committee to be represented at the Tenth Asian Regional Conference, stated that the Workers' group did not believe that committee to be a non-governmental international organisation in the usual sense of the term. They were therefore opposed to its being invited to attend the Conference.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) supported this view.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 16, 18 and 21 of the Office paper.

Second paper

Mr. Sarmadi (Government, Islamic Republic of Iran) stated that his Government had on a number of occasions stated that changes should be made in the procedures of the ILO's supervisory bodies in order to ensure that due account was taken of differing social and economic conditions and of different ideologies and value systems in different countries. The Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, however, did not include among its members any Islamic jurists.
The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 1, 5, 6, 9, 15, 19, 22 and 24 of the Office paper.

The Clerk of the Governing Body announced an amendment to paragraph 31 of the Office paper. The Employers' group wished to replace Mr. Gabriel Okogwu (Nigeria) by Mr. Anoruo Okere (Nigeria) as a substitute member of the Consultative Meeting on a World Training Conference.

Mr. Marton (Government, Hungary), referring to another nomination for the same meeting, requested clarification as to whether it was normal for a national of a non-member State to be appointed as a member of an ILO meeting.

The Chairman replied that the person in question was being nominated in his personal capacity by one of the non-governmental groups, and not as a representative of a State, and there had been precedents for this in the past.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 28, 32, 36, 43 and 48 of the Office paper.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) stated that the Employers regarded the Meeting of Experts on Occupational Safety and Health and Working Conditions Specifications in the Transfer of Technology to Developing Countries as concerning essentially the health hazards posed for workers.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 51, 56, 60, 63 and 68 of the Office paper.

TWENTY-FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Symposia, seminars and similar meetings

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) took it that the Asian subregional symposia on ILO standards were intended as educational events, and not as preliminary discussions of the item on the Conference agenda. If this was not so, the symposia would have to be held on a tripartite basis. As regards the workshop on people's participation in drought and famine relief in Africa, the Employers' group strongly doubted that this fell strictly within the competence of the ILO. The same applied to the African workshop on employment, food entitlements and State policies, which certainly seemed to lie at the limits of the ILO's mandate, if not beyond it. As regards the seminar-cum-study tour in the USSR on design and implementation of vocational training programmes for Asian countries, in view of the subject matter this seminar should be tripartite; furthermore, the Gulf regions seemed under-represented among the countries listed. He understood that Kuwait was highly interested in participating in the seminar. Turning to the Asian regional seminar on safety in coalmining, he felt that this also should be a tripartite seminar, and that it should therefore include an additional four employers' and four workers' representatives. Finally, as regards the Appendix, it would be useful at some future date to have a table listing the symposia, seminars and similar meetings held over the past few years, broken down by region and source of financing. This would be a useful reference document.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) stated that the two seminars relating to food issues and famine relief in
Africa seemed in line with the spirit of the resolution adopted by the 1985 Conference. The very fact of its adoption indicated that this subject was obviously regarded as well within the competence of the ILO.

The representative of the Director-General (Mr. Jain, Deputy Director-General) stated that it should be possible to include Kuwait among the countries taking part in the seminar-cum-study tour in the USSR on vocational training, provided that there was a corresponding reduction in the total number of participants from the other countries. Current practice regarding the listing of such meetings as an appendix to the paper submitted to the Governing Body derived from a recent proposal made by the Employers' group.

Mr. Koudriavtsev (Government, USSR) stated that it was perhaps a little late to reconsider participation in the seminar-cum-study tour in his country, and it would perhaps therefore be appropriate for the Office to consult with his Government to resolve the issue.

The Governing Body took note of the Office paper.

TWENTY-SECOND ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Report of the Director-General (concl.)

I. Obituary

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) expressed the sorrow of the Employers' group at the death of Mr. Rudolf Huber-Rübel, whom he had personally known over a period of ten years when the latter was Swiss Employers' delegate to the International Labour Conference and a substitute member of the Governing Body. He had greatly influenced the policies of the International Organisation of Employers, and his views were always influenced by his great experience, which lent them weight. He was of a polite and outgoing nature, and had made many friends. The Employers' group wished to extend its sympathy to his family.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) echoed Mr. Lindner's words regarding the personal qualities of Mr. Huber-Rübel. Both at the Conference and in the Governing Body he had shown particular understanding of many of the problems faced by workers. He was a progressive-minded man and had in fact personally invited him to examine the training centre at his firm. He had unfortunately not had time to accept the invitation, and he now regretted this. The Workers' group extended its condolences to the family of Mr. Huber-Rübel.

Mr. Gebre Medhin (Government, Ethiopia; Government Vice-Chairman), speaking on behalf of the Government members, paid tribute to the memory of Mr. Huber-Rübel and expressed regret on his death. He requested the Director-General to convey the sympathy of the Government group to the family of Mr. Huber-Rübel.

---

1 See also first sitting.
The Director-General wished to associate the Office with the tribute paid to the memory of Mr. Huber-Rübel. He had known him personally, and could attest to his unfailing courtesy. He would convey the condolences of the Governing Body to the family of Mr. Rudolf Huber-Rübel as soon as possible.

The Chairman stated that he had held the greatest respect for Mr. Huber-Rübel; he had maintained a close interest in the work of the Organisation right up to his death, and this reflected the dedication with which he had worked for the Organisation. He had a keen understanding of labour problems, and his death would mean a great loss to the Swiss Employers and to the ILO.

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

II. Composition of the Governing Body, Governing Body Committees and various bodies

The Governing Body took note of this section of the report.

III. Progress of international labour legislation

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) noted with regret the denunciation by the United Kingdom of two Conventions, including the Minimum Wage Fixing Machinery Convention, 1928 (No. 26). In 1971 the Governing Body had decided that governments wishing to denounce ratified Conventions were required to inform workers' and employers' organisations of their intention and to hold extensive consultations with them in advance concerning the application of the Convention in question and the measures they had taken in an attempt to overcome the problems of application. The Trade Union Congress of the United Kingdom had stated that no such extensive consultations had taken place in the present case. The reasons given for the denunciation in paragraph 17 were not convincing, and the denunciation seemed unjustifiable, particularly in its reference to the need for flexibility and freedom of action. The TUC strongly objected to the denunciation, which furthermore undermined the authority of the ILO and its standard-setting machinery.

Mr. Robinson (Government, United Kingdom) stated that the British Government had concluded that it was necessary to amend legislation on wages councils, through which the Convention had been implemented, in order to maximise youth employment, and the necessary amendment was incompatible with continued application of Convention No. 26. Contrary to the view of the TUC, extensive consultations had taken place with all parties concerned. The Government and the TUC had simply not agreed on the matter. The policy of the British Government was consistent: once ratified, a Convention should be applied; where new or amended legislation became incompatible with a Convention, then it was right to denounce the Convention, rather than proceed with legislation that was obviously at variance with it. Denunciation was a procedure for which there was specific provision in the Constitution, and the consultative procedure required by that same provision had in the present case been fully observed.
Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) considered that there was not sufficient time to hold a general debate on the denunciation of the Conventions or the relation between wages and employment. Those issues were best discussed elsewhere.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) stated that he was simply reporting the view of the British TUC that it had not been adequately consulted on the matter.

The Governing Body took note of this section of the report.

IV. Internal administration

V. Publications and documents

The Governing Body took note of these sections of the report.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Agenda of the 72nd (1986) Session of the Conference: wording of item VI

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

SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Model forms of register of ships' lifting appliances and certificates as required by ILO Convention No. 152

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

THIRD SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Request for participation of a liberation movement in the Tenth Asian Regional Conference (Jakarta, 4-13 December 1985)

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

Request by a non-member State to be represented at
the Tenth Asian Regional Conference
(Jakarta, 4-13 December 1985)

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

FIFTH SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Request by a non-member State to be represented at
the Tenth Asian Regional Conference
(Jakarta, 4-13 December 1985)

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

SIXTH SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Participation of intergovernmental organisations
in the Twelfth Conference of American States Members of the ILO

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

SEVENTH SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Request by an additional non-governmental international organisation to be represented at the
Tenth Asian Regional Conference
(Jakarta, 4-13 December 1985)

The Governing Body adopted the recommendation in paragraph 3 of the report.
TWENTY-THIRD ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Programme of meetings

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) stressed that it was important for the working papers prepared for the Tenth Asian Regional Conference to be distributed sufficiently in advance of the Conference.

Mr. Lindner (Employer, Federal Republic of Germany) noted a number of apparent anomalies in the paper. While the Industrial Activities Committee had listed the Chemical Industries Committee among those proposed for the 1986-87 biennium, it had been omitted from the list of meetings now submitted to the Governing Body. This list also failed to respect the order of priority among major industrial meetings recommended by the Industrial Activities Committee. There were no proposals for the Advisory Committee on Rural Development, although it ranked third in that order of priority. The Advisory Committee deserved high priority because it covered an extremely important subject, and the Office should therefore indicate when it planned to hold its next session.

Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice-Chairman) agreed that the Advisory Committee on Rural Development should be included. As regards the Chemical Industries Committee, the Governing Body had postponed the next session of that Committee to the 1988-89 biennium for budgetary reasons. He requested clarification on the specific dates of the Meeting on Employment, Structural Adjustment and Equity planned for November 1986, as this was an extremely important meeting likely to have a heavy agenda, and it was necessary to contact potential participants well in advance. The Workers' group was somewhat displeased at the pattern of major industrial meetings planned for the 1986-87 biennium, as it would have been preferable for those meetings to have been spaced out at more regular intervals over the two-year period.

The Clerk of the Governing Body announced two amendments to the paper. It was now planned to hold the Joint Meeting on Employment and Working Conditions in Electricity, Gas and Water Supply Services from 1 to 13 May 1987; and the Tripartite Meeting on Salaried Authors and Inventors from 13 to 21 October 1987.

The Director-General announced that it was planned to hold the Meeting on Employment, Structural Adjustment and Equity from 4 to 7 November 1986. In reply to Mr. Muhr's statement regarding the Tenth Asian Regional Conference, the last of the working papers for the Conference had been despatched on 20 October.

A representative of the Director-General (Mr. Milne, Chief of the Sectoral Activities Department) stated in reply to Mr. Lindner that while the Office had endeavoured to respect the order of priority identified by the Industrial Activities Committee for the major industrial meetings, problems of dates and resources had made it necessary to postpone the Third Tripartite Technical Meeting for the Clothing Industry and the Twelfth Session of the Coal Mines Committee to 1987. For the same reasons the Chemical Industries Committee had been postponed to the 1988-89 biennium.

Mr. Marton (Government, Hungary) thought it would be advisable, if any such changes were necessary, to inform in the first instance the officers of the Industrial Activities Committee.
The Director-General pointed out that, as indicated in the Office paper, it was planned to hold the next session of the African Advisory Committee during the first fortnight of December 1987. This was not a definitive proposal, as it seemed somewhat overdue, the previous session of the Committee having been held in 1981 and the last African Regional Conference in 1983. He invited the Governing Body to reflect further on the matter.

The Governing Body adopted the recommendations in paragraphs 3 and 11 of the Office paper.

TWENTY-FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Appointment of Governing Body representatives on various bodies

The following nominations were approved:

Twelfth Conference of American States Members of the ILO (Montreal, 18-26 March 1986)

Government group: Mr. Yahia Briki (Algeria);
Employers' group: Mr. Lacasa Aso;
Workers' group: Substitute: Mr. Said;
Substitute: Mr. Mendoza.

Tenth Session of the Petroleum Committee (Geneva, 9-17 April 1986)

Government group: Mr. Sarmadi (Islamic Republic of Iran);
Employers' group: Miss Hak;
Workers' group: Substitute: Mr. Okogwu;
Substitute: Mr. Sudono.

Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference (Geneva, 5-16 May 1986)

Government group: Ethiopia (name to be supplied);
Employers' group: Mr. Yoshino;
Workers' group: Mr. Svenningsen.
Mr. Muhr (Worker, Federal Republic of Germany; Worker Vice Chairman) announced that Mr. Youcef Briki was unable to attend the Tenth Asian Regional Conference, and would be replaced by Mr. Mohamed. Mr. Sudono was unable to attend the Third Tripartite Technical Meeting for the Leather and Footwear Industry, and would be replaced by Mr. Chiroma.

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING THE TENTH ASIAN REGIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Joedonagoro (Government, Indonesia) stated that Indonesia was honoured to act as host for the Tenth Asian Regional Conference in Jakarta in the coming month. His Government had done its utmost to cater for all needs of the participants and to ensure that all necessary arrangements for the smooth functioning of the Conference had been made in order to guarantee its success. His country looked forward to welcoming all participants.

The session was declared closed at 6.55 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>French Description</th>
<th>English Description</th>
<th>Spanish Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Représentant gouvernemental - Government representative</td>
<td>Representante gubernamental</td>
<td>Representante de un gobierno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Membre employeur - Employer member - Miembro empleador</td>
<td>Employeur membre - Miembro trabajador</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Membre travailleur - Worker member - Miembro trabajador</td>
<td>Travailleur membre - Miembro trabajador</td>
<td>Representante de una organización no gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Suppléant gouvernemental - Government substitute - Suplente</td>
<td>Suplente membre - Miembro trabajador</td>
<td>Representante de una organización internacional no gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Suppléant employeur - Employer substitute - Suplente employeur</td>
<td>Suplente membre - Miembro trabajador</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Suppléant travailleur - Worker substitute - Suplente travailleur</td>
<td>Suplente membre - Miembro trabajador</td>
<td>Representante de una organización no gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCT</td>
<td>Conseiller technique gouvernemental - Government adviser</td>
<td>Consejero técnico - Miembro trabajador</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECT</td>
<td>Conseiller technique employeur - Employer adviser</td>
<td>Consejero técnico - Miembro trabajador</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCT</td>
<td>Conseiller technique travailleur - Worker adviser</td>
<td>Consejero técnico - Miembro trabajador</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Représentant gouvernemental (membre adjoint) - Government representative (deputy member)</td>
<td>Representante de un gobierno (miembro adjunto)</td>
<td>Representante de un gobierno (miembro adjunto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Membre employeur adjoint - Employer deputy member</td>
<td>Empleador membre adjunto</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Membre travailleur adjoint - Worker deputy member</td>
<td>Trabajador membre adjunto</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>Suppléant gouvernemental (membre adjoint) - Government substitute (deputy member)</td>
<td>Suplente membre (miembro adjunto)</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACT</td>
<td>Conseiller technique gouvernemental (membre adjoint) - Government adviser (deputy member)</td>
<td>Consejero técnico (miembro adjunto)</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACT</td>
<td>Conseiller technique employeur (membre adjoint) - Employer adviser (deputy member)</td>
<td>Consejero técnico (miembro adjunto)</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACT</td>
<td>Conseiller technique travailleur (membre adjoint) - Worker adviser (deputy member)</td>
<td>Consejero técnico (miembro adjunto)</td>
<td>Representante de una organización gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNM</td>
<td>Représentant d'un gouvernement non Membre - Representative of a non-member government</td>
<td>Representante de un gobierno no Miembro.</td>
<td>Representante de un gobierno no Miembro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>Représentant d'une organisation internationale gouvernementale - Representative of an international governmental organisation</td>
<td>Representante de una organización internacional gubernamental</td>
<td>Representante de una organización internacional gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONG</td>
<td>Représentant d'une organisation internationale non gouvernementale - Representative of an international non-governmental organisation</td>
<td>Representante de una organización no gubernamental</td>
<td>Representante de una organización no gubernamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Gouvernement invité au titre de l'article 24 ou 26 de la Constitution</td>
<td>State Member invited in accordance with article 24 or 26 of the Constitution</td>
<td>Estado Miembro de la Organización invitado en virtud del artículo 24 o 26 de la Constitución.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GCT  ABDEL-WAHID, Thamya Rashid, Miss, Director, International Affairs and Conferences Department (Iraq).

GACT  ABDUSSALAM, Muftah, Mr., Attaché (Labour Affairs), Permanent Mission of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in Geneva (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

T  ADIKO, N., M. (Côte-d'Ivoire), secrétaire général, Union générale des travailleurs de la Côte-d'Ivoire.

G  AITKEN, Probyn W., Mr., Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of Jamaica on the Governing Body (Jamaica).

GNM  AIZPURUA PEREZ, I., Sra., consejero, Misión Permanente de Panamá en Ginebra (Panamá).

GNM  AKINCİ, Naci, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Turkey in Geneva (Turkey).

GS  AKRAM, Zamir, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Pakistan in Geneva (Pakistan).

ONG  AKUMU, James Dennis, Mr., Secretary-General (Organisation of African Trade Union Unity).

EA  AL-JASSEM, A., Mr. (Kuwait), Assistant Director-General, Kuwait Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

GNM  AL-QUTAISH, M.S., S.E., Ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la République démocratique populaire du Yémen à Genève (Yémen démocratique).

GAS  ALBALATE LAFITA, Joaquín, Sr., agregado laboral, Misión Permanente de España en Ginebra; representante suplente del Gobierno de España ante el Consejo de Administración (España).

GS  ALEMÁN, Oscar, Sr., consejero, Misión Permanente de Nicaragua en Ginebra (Nicaragua).

GS  ALEXANDER, D.C., Mr., Department of Employment (United Kingdom).

GNM  ALFARARGI, Saad, H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva (Egypt).

GS  ALI, Ashraf, Mr., Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Manpower and Overseas Pakistanis (Pakistan).

GNM  ANDERSEN, 0. Brix, Mr., Head of Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DANIDA) (Denmark).

GS  ANDO, Masahiro, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva (Japan).

GNM  ANDREEV, Kosta, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Bulgaria in Geneva (Bulgaria).

OI  ANSAR-KHAN, H., Mr., Senior Liaison Officer, Center Against Apartheid (United Nations).

EA  ARBESSER-RASTBURG, Max, Mr. (Austria), Manager, Herz-Armaturen GmbH.
GCT ARCURI, Juan José, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra (Argentina).

GNM ARTHUR, Guillermo, Sr., Subsecretario del Trabajo (Chile).

TCT BAKER, James, Mr., Deputy European Representative, AFL-CIO, Paris; accompanying Mr. Brown.

GS BALAKRISHNAN, B., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India in Geneva (India).

ES BALBOUL, F., Mr., Personal substitute for Mr. Nasr.

TA BALDASSINI, R.A., Sr. (Argentina), Secretario General, Confederación General del Trabajo.

TACT BARANYAI, Eva, Mrs., Head of International Department, Central Council of Hungarian Trade Unions; accompanying Mr. Timmer.

OI BARNOUNIN, Jack P., Mr., Assistant Director, Geneva Office (International Monetary Fund).

GNM BEDIRI, Hichem, M., chef de service, ministère des Affaires sociales (Tunisie).

GNM BEL HADJ HASSINE, Sadok, M., Secrétaire général, ministère des Affaires sociales (Tunisie).

OI BELORUS, O., Mr., Director of the Industry and Technology Division, Economic Commission for Europe (United Nations).

ECT BELOW, Hans Jürgen, Mr., Assessor, Confederation of German Employers' Associations; accompanying Mr. Lindner.

OI BENELMOUFFOK, A., Mr., Manufactures Division (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development).

GNM BENHIMA, El Ghali, S.E., Ambassadeur; Représentant permanent du Royaume du Maroc à Genève (Maroc).

GNM BERTELLO, Giuseppe, Monseigneur, conseiller de Nonciature, chargé d'affaires a.i., Mission permanente du Saint-Siège à Genève (Saint-Siège).

G BHATNAGAR, H.M.S., Mr., Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour; representative of the Government of India on the Governing Body (India).

GNM BIGGAR, J.D., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ireland in Geneva (Ireland).

GAS BIRBAUM, Günter, Mr., Minister, Deputy Permanent Representative of Austria in Geneva (Austria).

GCT BISKUP, Eckehard, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany in Geneva (Federal Republic of Germany).

ONG BLEUX, Flor, M., secrétaire général adjoint (Confédération mondiale du travail).
TA BLONDEL, Marc, M. (France), secrétaire confédéral de la Confédération générale du travail Force ouvrière (CGT-FO).

GCT BOHR, Klaus, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany in Geneva (Federal Republic of Germany).

GNM BORCHERT, Hans-Joachim, Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of the German Democratic Republic in Geneva (German Democratic Republic).

GS BRIKI, Yahia, M., ministre plénipotentiaire, ministère des Affaires étrangères (Algérie).

T BRIKI, Youcef, M. (Algérie), secrétaire de l'Union générale des travailleurs Algériens.

EA BRILLINGER, R.H., Mr. (Canada), Director, Industrial Relations, Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

T BROWN, I., Mr. (United States), Director, Department of International Affairs of the AFL-CIO.

GACT BRUAAS, Odd., Mr., Senior Executive Officer, Ministry of Local Government and Labour (Norway).

OI BRUNI, A., Mr., Human Rights Officer, Centre for Human Rights (United Nations).

GNM CADIZ, Luis Eugenio, Sr., ministro consejero, Misión Permanente de Chile en Ginebra (Chile).

GACT CAMPBELL, N., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva (Australia).

G(ex officio) CARMEN, Gerald P., H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of the United States in Geneva (United States).

GS CARON, Lucille, Mme, directrice des Relations internationales, ministère du Travail (Canada).

GCT CARTIER, Jean-Louis, M., administrateur civil, sous-directeur, chef de la Division des relations internationales, ministère du Travail, de l'Emploi et de la Formation professionnelle (France).

GCT CARVALHO LOPES de, F.J., Sr., consejero, Misión Permanente del Brasil en Ginebra (Brasil).

GACT CHAMORRO, Santiago, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de España en Ginebra (España).

GCT CHANAIWA, D.S., Mr., Director, Department of Employment and Employment Development, Ministry of Labour, Manpower Planning and Social Welfare (Zimbabwe).

GCT CHERIEF, Mohamed Aziz, M., sous-directeur des activités internationales du travail, ministère de la Formation professionnelle et du Travail (Algérie).

G CHIBA, Kazuo, H.E., Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Permanent Representative of Japan in Geneva; representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body (Japan).
TA  CHIROMA, Ali, Mr. (Nigeria), President, Nigeria Labour Congress.

GAS  CHLUMSKY, Pavel, Mr., Deputy Permanent Representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in Geneva (Czechoslovakia).

GS  CHRISTIAN, L.K., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ghana in Geneva (Ghana).

GS  CLAUWAERT, Jenny, Srta., tercer secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra (Venezuela).

GA  COSME RITA, Bonfim Afonso, M., directeur des relations internationales, ministère du Travail et de la Prévoyance sociale (Sao Tomé-et-Príncipe).

GNM  COUNINOTIS, Nicolaos, M., conseiller, représentant permanent adjoint de la Grèce à Genève (Grèce).

GA  CRESPO RODAS, Alfonso, S.E., Embajador; representante permanente de Bolivia en Ginebra; representante del Gobierno de Bolivia ante el Consejo de Administración (Bolivia).

GA  CRESPO VALERA, Segismundo, Sr., Subsecretario de Trabajo y Seguridad Social; representante del Gobierno de España ante el Consejo de Administración (España).

GCT  DALLEAU, Hélène, Mme, chargé de mission, Division des relations internationales, ministère du Travail, de l'Emploi et de la Formation professionnelle (France).

GNM  DANIELI, David, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Israel in Geneva (Israel).

GNM  DANIELSSON, Lars, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Sweden in Geneva (Sweden).

GNM  DATCU, Ion, S.E., Ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la République socialiste de Roumanie à Genève (Roumanie).

GCT  DAVEREDE, Alberto L., Sr., Ministro Plenipotenciario, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra (Argentina).

GCT  DAVID, T., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva (United Kingdom).

TA  DAVID, V., Mr. (Malaysia), Secretary-General, Malaysian Trades Union Congress.


GNM  DE LUCA, Roberto, S.E., Embajador; Representante Permanente de Panamá en Ginebra (Italie).

GCT  DE MAIO, Enrico, M., premier conseiller, Mission permanente de l'Italie à Genève (Italie).

GCT  DE MELO, Carmelito, Sr., segundo secretario, Misión Permanente del Brasil en Ginebra (Brasil).

T  DELPINO, Juan José, Sr. (Venezuela), Presidente, Confederación de Trabajadores de Venezuela.
DERBI, Abdulhafiz, Mr., Director of the Producers' Fund, General People's Committee of Public Service (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

DEVONIC, F., Miss, Principal Administrator, Directory-General of Employment, Social Affairs and Education (Commission of the European Communities).

DIAZ GARAYCOA, F., Sr. (Ecuador), vicepresidente jurídico, Federación Nacional de Cámaras de Industrias del Ecuador.

DIMASE, Leonardo Enrique, Sr., Secretario de Estado, representante del Gobierno de la República Argentina ante el Consejo de Administración (Argentina).

DIOP, Madia, M. (Sénégal), secrétaire général, Confédération nationale des travailleurs du Sénégal.

DJERMAKOYE, A., Mrs., External Relations and Inter-Agency Affairs Officer (United Nations).

DJORDJEVIC, Marija, Mrs., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Yugoslavia in Geneva.

DOLAN, C.O., Mr. (Australia), President, Australian Council of Trade Unions.

DOOGE, M.J., Mr. (Zimbabwe), President, Employers' Confederation of Zimbabwe.

DORAIS, Michel, M., directeur général, Politiques et Liaison, ministère du Travail (Canada).

DOWEK, Ephraim, H.E., Ambassador Plenipotentiary; Permanent Representative of Israel in Geneva (Israel).

DUCRAY, Gabriel, M., directeur régional du Travail en congé spécial; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la France au Conseil d'administration (France).

DUFOUR, C., Mr., Attaché, member of the Delegation in Geneva (Commission of the European Communities).

DURLING, Walter, Sr. (Panamá), Consejo Nacional de la Empresa Privada de Panamá; Director, American Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Panama; President, Walter Durling, Consultants and Counsellors, Inc.

ECLIN, Richard W., Mr., Economist, Geneva Office (International Monetary Fund).

EL HAJJE, Osman, M., attaché (affaires juridiques et sociales), Délégation permanente à Genève (Ligue des États arabes).

EL MASDUR, Farag, Mr., Counsellor (Labour Affairs), Permanent Mission of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in Geneva (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

EL MAY, Moncef, S.E., Ambassadeur, observateur permanent à Genève (Ligue des États arabes).
GACT EL ZLITNI, Hamed A., Mr., Department of the United Nations and Specialised Agencies, General People's Committee of Foreign Liaisons (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya).

OI EL-TELAWI, Adnan Khalil, M., chef, Délégation permanente à Genève (Organisation arabe du travail).

OI ELMICHER, P.-M., Miss, External Relations Officer, Collaboration with the United Nations System, Non-Governmental and other Organisations (World Health Organisation).

E ESCOBAR PADRON, Jairo, Sr. (Colombia), vicepresidente (Asuntos Sociales y Laborales), Asociación Nacional de Industriales.

GS EZDI, Asif, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Pakistan in Geneva (Pakistan).

G FALCHI, Giovanni, S.E., Ambassadeur; représentant du gouvernement de l'Italie au Conseil d'administration (Italie).

GCT FALKNER, William, Mr., Deputy Director for Industrial and Communications Programs, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State (United States).

OI FALL, I.D., Mr., Technical Officer, Programme Support Services, Office for Europe (United Nations Children's Fund).

OI FARAG, Aziz, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Delegation in Geneva (Organisation of African Unity).

GNM FASANYA, J.O., Mr., Labour Attaché, Permanent Mission of Nigeria in Geneva (Nigeria).

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

GNM FAUR, Virgiliu, M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente de la République socialiste de Roumanie à Genève (Roumanie).

GCT FENG CUI, Mrs., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China in Geneva (China).

GNM FERNANDEZ BALLESTEROS, Carlos, A., Sr., ministro, representante permanente adjunto del Uruguay en Ginebra (Uruguay).

OI FINN, Sean M., Mr., Deputy Executive Co-ordinator (United Nations).

GCT FINSKAS, Ulla-Maija, Ms., Secretary (Development Co-operation), Ministry for Foreign Affairs (Finland).

E FLUNER, D.J., Mr. (United Kingdom), Chairman, International Labour Committee, Confederation of British Industry.

GA FOTHERINGHAM, Ross A., Mr., Minister (Special Labour Adviser), Permanent Mission of Australia in Geneva; representative of the Government of Australia on the Governing Body (Australia).

GA GALLEGOS LOPEZ, Sergio, Sr., consejero, Misión Permanente de México en Ginebra; representante suplente del Gobierno de México ante el Consejo de Administración (México).
GNM GAMIL, Suzanne, Miss, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt in Geneva (Egypt).

GA GARCIA de GONZALES, Gladys, Sr., consejero, Encargado de Negocios, a.i., Misión Permanente de Cuba en Ginebra (Cuba).

GS GARCIA GARCIA, Oscar, Sr., segundo secretario, Misión Permanente de Venezuela en Ginebra (Venezuela).

OI GAUTIER, M.-L., Mrs., Reports Officer, Programme Support Services, Office for Europe (United Nations Children’s Fund).

GS GEBRE MEDHIN, Getachew, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Ethiopia in Geneva (Ethiopia).

E GEORGET, Henri, M. (Niger), entrepreneur.

EA GHARBAOUI, A., M. (Maroc), directeur général, Fédération des chambres de commerce et d'industrie du Maroc.

Ginebra (Panamá).

GNM GROTH, Carl-Johan, Mr., Minister Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Representative of Sweden in Geneva (Sweden).

GS GUTEMA, Hanna, Mrs., Head, International Relations, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Ethiopia).

G HAASE, Winfrid, Mr., Head of Department, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs; representative of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on the Governing Body (Federal Republic of Germany).

OI HABENICHT, H., Mr., Director, Department of Planning, Liaison and Research (Intergovernmental Committee for Migration).

GNM HAGEN, Kees, Mr., Deputy Chief of the International Social Affairs Division, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (Netherlands).

EA HAK, Cornelie, Miss (Netherlands), Chief, International Social Affairs Division, Netherlands Council of Employers’ Federations.

GNM HALFAOUI, Mustafa, M., deuxième secrétaire, Mission permanente du Royaume du Maroc à Genève (Maroc).

GCT HAMALA, Hannu, Mr., Chief of Section, Ministry for Foreign Affairs (Finland).

ONG HAMERNIK, Emilian, M., chef du Département pour les relations avec les Nations Unies (Fédération syndicale mondiale).

GNM HANBERRY, B., Mr., Attaché, Permanent Mission of Ireland in Geneva (Ireland).

GNM HARALAMPIEV, Raytcho, Mr., Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of Bulgaria in Geneva (Bulgaria).

GCT HARE, Robert C., Mr., Labor Attaché, Permanent Mission of the United States in Geneva (United States).
GNM HASCHKE, Herbert, Mr., Minister Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Representative of the German Democratic Republic in Geneva (German Democratic Republic).

GA HELDAL, Halldor, Mr., Deputy Director, Ministry of Local Government and Labour (Norway).

GNM HELDRING, Alexander, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Netherlands in Geneva (Netherlands).

GAS HEREDIA PEREZ, Julio, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Cuba en Ginebra (Cuba).

GAS HERNANDEZ OLIVA, Gretel, Sra., funcionaria de la Dirección de Relaciones Internacionales del Comité Estatal de Trabajo y Seguridad Social (Cuba).

GACT HERRERA BERNALDEZ, Javier, Sr., consejero técnico, Subsecretaría de Trabajo y Seguridad Social (España).

ES HIGHLAND, A. Cory, Mr., Manager, International Labor Affairs, United States Council for International Business; personal substitute for Mr. Katz.


GS HIRAGA, Toshiyuki, Mr., Assistant Minister for International Labour Affairs, Ministry of Labour; substitute representative of the Government of Japan on the Governing Body (Japan).

GAS HOLMBOE RUGE, Mari, Ms., Chief of Division, Ministry of Local Government and Labour (Norway).

E HOLTEN von, Johan, Mr. (Sweden), Director, Swedish Employers' Confederation.

GNM HOSSAIN, Syed Noor, Mr., Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Bangladesh in Geneva (Bangladesh).

GCT HYNES, Ross G., M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente du Canada à Genève (Canada).

ONG IBRAHIM, Ali, Mr., Assistant Secretary-General (Organisation of African Trade Union Unity).

GNM ISAACSON, Bert, Mr., Assistant Under-Secretary, Ministry of Labour (Sweden).

GNM JORGENSEN, Peter, Mr., Head of Section, International Relations Division, Ministry of Labour (Denmark).

GCT JACKSON, Justin, Mr., Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United States in Geneva (United States).

GCT JACOLIN, Henri, M., conseiller des Affaires étrangères, Directions des Nations Unies et des organisations internationales, ministère des Relations extérieures (France).
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GCT JALALUDDIN, Mizwar, Mr., Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva (Indonesia).

OI JENNINGS, B.M., Mr., Geneva Office (Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations).

G JOEDONAGORO, Danang D., Mr., Special Adviser to the Minister, Department of Manpower (Indonesia).

GACT JORDA FERNANDEZ, Sara, Sra., consejero técnico, Subsecretaría de Trabajo y Seguridad Social (España).

GNM JORDAO, Manuel, M., attaché (affaires sociales et du travail), Mission permanente du Portugal à Genève (Portugal).

GS JOUKOV, A.D., M., ministre plénipotentiaire, représentant permanent adjoint de l'URSS à Genève (URSS).

GCT JUWANA, Mr., Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Indonesia in Geneva (Indonesia).

G KABORE, Béléko Pierre, M., directeur central du Travail, ministère du Travail, de la Sécurité sociale et de la Fonction publique (Burkina Faso).

OI KADRY, Usamah, Mr., Head, Inter-Agency Co-ordination, External Affairs Division (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

GCT KAITCHOUK, M.A., M., troisième secrétaire, Mission permanente de l'URSS à Genève (URSS).

GS KAMOGAWA, Sachio, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan in Geneva (Japan).

ONG KAPARTIS, Costas, Mr., Deputy Secretary-General (International Organisation of Employers).

GCT KARANKO, Kari, Mr., Chief of Bureau, Ministry for Foreign Affairs (Finland).

OI KATUNGI, C., Mr., Chief of Cabinet (United Nations Environment Programme).

E KATZ, A., Mr. (United States), President, United States Council for International Business.

G KAZMI, M.A., Mr., Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Manpower and Overseas Pakistanis (Pakistan).

G KEBEDE, Kassa, H.E., Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary; Member of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia; Permanent Representative of Ethiopia in Geneva; representative of the Government of Ethiopia on the Governing Body (Ethiopia).

G KERROUM, Nourdine, S.E., Ambassadeur; représentant permanent de la République algérienne démocratique et populaire à Genève (Algérie).

GNM KIRUBANATHAN, J.D., Mr., Labour Attaché, Permanent Mission of Malaysia in Geneva (Malaysia).
GS KOENTARSO, Poedji, H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Indonesia in Geneva (Indonesia).


GS KOUHRIAVTSEV, E.V., M., directeur adjoint, département des organisations économiques internationales, ministère des Affaires étrangères (URSS).

ONG KOUZMINE, V., Mr., Liaison Officer with International Organisations (International Co-operative Alliance).

OI KURZ, Hans, Mr., Senior Programme Officer, UNDP European Office (United Nations Development Programme).

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

ONG LAGASSE, R., Mr., Secretary-General (International Organisation of Employers).

OI LANDYMORE, A., Mr., Adviser, Geneva Office (Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations).

GAS LANGHAMMER, Herbert, Mr., Senior Counsellor, Ministry for Social Affairs (Austria).

OI LARRE, D., Mr., Director; UNEP Industry and Environment Office (United Nations Environment Programme).

ONG LAURIJSSEN, E., Mr., Assistant Director, Geneva Office (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions).

GCT LAVAL, Antoine, M., chargé de mission auprès du Président du Conseil économique et social (France).

TACT LIANG RENYUAN, Mr., Member of the Committee on International Affairs, ACFTU; accompanying Mr. Wang Jiachong.

E LINDNER, Wolf-Dieter, Mr. (Federal Republic of Germany), Chief, International Social Policy Branch, Confederation of German Employers' Associations.

GCT LINSENMAJER, Tadd, Mr., Director, Office of International Organizations, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor (United States).

G LIPATOV, Valentin N., M., Ministre adjoint des Affaires étrangères (RSS d’Ukraine).

GCT LIU YOUJIN, Mr., Deputy Director, Bureau of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Labour and Personnel (China).

OI LOHRMANN, R., Mr., Research and Liaison Officer, Department of Planning, Liaison and Research (Intergovernmental Committee for Migration).

GS LOPEZ NOGUEROL, Osvaldo, S.E., Embajador; Representante Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra (Argentina).
OL LOWE, Maryellen, Mrs., Chief, External Relations and Information (United Nations).

GNM LUNA, Luis Alberto, Sr., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de Colombia en Ginebra (Colombia).

G M'POLO, Wuta, M., directeur, Département des relations internationales, ministère du Travail et de la Sécurité sociale (Angola).

TA MAIER, H., Mr. (Austria), Adviser, Austrian Confederation of Trade Unions.

G MAKONI, Z.C.I., Mr., Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Manpower Planning and Social Welfare (Zimbabwe).

GS MALHOTRA, Ajai, Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of India in Geneva (India).

GCT MALIN, K., Mr., First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom in Geneva (United Kingdom).

GS MALKO, Youri F., M., deuxième secrétaire, Mission permanente de la RSS d'Ukraine à Genève; représentant suppléant du gouvernement de la RSS d'Ukraine au Conseil d'administration (RSS d'Ukraine).

TCT MALLON, Brian, Mr., National Representative, Canadian Labour Congress; accompanying Mr. Mercier.

GA MARTINEK, Oswin, Dr., Head of Social Policy and Labour Law Department, Ministry for Social Affairs; representative of the Government of Austria on the Governing Body (Austria).

G MARTON, Tamás, M., chef de département au Bureau d'Etat du travail et des salaires; représentant du gouvernement de la Hongrie au Conseil d'administration (Hongrie).

G McQUEEN, Jennifer, Mme, sous-ministre, ministère du Travail (Canada).

T MEHTA, Kanti, Mr. (India), General Secretary, Indian National Trade Union Congress.

GNM MELESCANU, Teodor, M., conseiller, Mission permanente de la République socialiste de Roumanie à Genève (Roumanie).

GNM MELLO e CASTRO, António, M., conseiller, Mission permanente du Portugal à Genève (Portugal).

TA MENDOZA, D.T., Mr. (Philippines), President, Trade Union Congress of the Philippines.

GA MENSAR, Nathanael, M., ministre du Travail et des Affaires sociales (Bénin).

T MERCIER, Richard, Mr. (Canada), Executive Vice-President, Canadian Labour Congress.

ONG MITVAYEV, Ivan I., M., représentant permanent à Genève (Fédération syndicale mondiale).

GA MOLKOVA, Dagmar, Mrs., Deputy Minister of Labour and Social Affairs (Czechoslovakia).

GCT MOMAL, Jean-Marie, M., conseiller des affaires étrangères, Mission permanente de la France à Genève (France).

EA MONTT BALMACEDA, M., Sr. (Chile), presidente, Comisión de Asuntos Internacionales del Trabajo, Confederación de la Producción y del Comercio.

T MORTON, John, Mr. (United Kingdom), General Secretary, Musicians' Union.

GA MOTSHIDISI, K.K., Mr., Commissioner of Labour (Botswana).

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

GACT MUNKERBYE, Henriette, Ms., Chief of Division, Ministry of Local Government and Labour (Norway).

OI MUNTASSER, B., Mr., Principal Liaison Officer (United Nations Fund for Population Activities).

OI NABULSI, Hikmat, Mr., UNV Executive Co-ordinator (United Nations).

ONG NADEAU, R.W., M., chef du Service de l'administration générale (Association internationale de la sécurité sociale).

GCT NASCIMBENE de DUMONT, Norma, Sra., primer secretario, Misión Permanente de la República Argentina en Ginebra (Argentina).

E NASR, M., Mr. (Lebanon), Association of Lebanese Industrialists.

GACT NDAYEGAMIYE, Protais, M., deuxième conseiller, Mission permanente du Burundi à Genève (Burundi).

GA NICOLAIDES, Andros, H.E., Ambassador; Permanent Representative of Cyprus in Geneva; substitute representative of the Government of Cyprus on the Governing Body (Cyprus).

GS NITIAMIDJAJA, Muslich, Mr., Official, Department of Manpower (Indonesia).

GA NUYONGABO, Gérard, M., premier secrétaire, Mission permanente du Burundi à Genève (Burundi).

GNM OBADI, H., M., conseiller, Mission permanente de la République démocratique populaire du Yémen à Genève (Yémen démocratique).

E OECHSLIN, Jean-Jacques, M. (France), directeur des questions sociales internationales, Conseil national du patronat français; Président du Conseil d'administration.

EA OKOGWU, Gabriel Chike, Mr. (Nigeria), Executive Director, Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association.

GNM OLSSON, Mari Ann, Ms., Head of Section, Ministry of Labour (Sweden).
OLP OPELZ, Merle, Mrs., Head of the IAEA Office in Geneva (International
Atomic Energy Agency).

ORIBI, Misbah, M., Observateur permanent adjoint (Ligue des Etats
arabes).

ORLOV, A.V., M., deuxième secrétaire, Mission permanente de l'URSS à
Genève (URSS).

ORTIZ, Pauline, Ms., Assistant, International Department, Trade Union
Congress; accompanying Mr. Morton.

OSMAN, Fatoum, Mme, chef du Service administratif et juridique
(Djibouti).

OSTERBERG, Sonja, Mrs., Swedish Employers' Confederation; accompanying
Mr. von Holten.

OUEDRAOGO, C., M. (Burkina Faso), Vice-président, Conseil national du
Patronat burkinabé.

OUZIR, El Hachem, M., sous-directeur des relations sociales et
professionnelles, ministère de la Formation professionnelle et du
Travail (Algérie).

OWUOR, T.D., Mr. (Kenya), Executive Director, Federation of Kenya
Employers.

OZADOVSKI, Andreï A., M., représentant permanent de la RSS d'Ukraine à
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